arXiv:1703.02022v3 [math.PR] 25 Apr 2017

Hypergeometric SLE and Convergence of Critical Planar Ising Interface

Hao Wu

Abstract

This article pertains to the classification of pairs of simple random curves with conformal Markov property and symmetry. Such pairs correspond to scaling limits of pairs of interfaces in critical lattice model with alternating boundary conditions in topological rectangles. Conformal Markov property and symmetry single out a two-parameter family of random curves: Hypergeometric SLE, denoted by $\mathrm{hSLE}_\kappa(\nu)$ for $\kappa \in (0,4]$ and $\nu < \kappa - 6$.

We also prove that the interface of critical Ising model with these boundary conditions converges to hSLE_3. The method developed in this paper does not require constructing new holomorphic observable and the input is the convergence of the interface with Dobrushin boundary condition. This method could be applied to other lattice models, for instance Loop-Erased Random Walk and level lines of discrete Gaussian Free Field.

Keywords: Hypergeometric SLE, conformal Markov property, critical planar Ising interface.

1 Introduction

Conformal invariance and critical phenomena in two-dimensional lattice models play the central role in mathematical physics in the last few decades. We take Ising model as an example (see details in Section 5). Suppose Ω is a simply connected domain and x, y are distinct boundary points. When one considers the critical Ising model in $\Omega \cap \mathbb{Z}^2$ with Dobrushin boundary conditions: $\oplus$ along the boundary arc (xy) and $\ominus$ along the boundary arc (yx), an interface from x to y appears naturally which separates $\oplus$-spin from $\ominus$-spin. The scaling limit of the interface, if exists, is believed to satisfy conformal invariance and domain Markov property. We call the combination of the two as *conformal Markov property*. Thus, to understand the scaling limit of interfaces in critical lattice model, one needs to understand random curves with conformal Markov property.

In [Sch00], O. Schramm introduced SLE which is a random growth process in simply connected domain starting from one boundary point to another boundary point. This is a one-parameter family of random curves, denoted by SLE_κ with $\kappa \geq 0$. This family is the only one with both conformal invariance and domain Markov property, and is conjectured to be the scaling limits of interface in critical models. Since its introduction, this conjecture has been rigorously proved for several models: Percolation [Smi01, CN07], the Loop-Erased Random Walk and the Uniform Spanning Tree [LSW04], level lines of the discrete Gaussian Free Field [SS09, SS13], and the critical Ising and FK-Ising models [CS12, CDCH$^+$14].

SLE process corresponds to the scaling limit of interface in critical model with Dobrushin boundary condition. It is natural to consider critical model with more complicate boundary conditions. In this article, we focus on the alternating boundary condition in topological rectangles (*quads* for short). We take Ising model as an example again. Suppose Ω is a simply connected domain and x^R, y^R, y^L, x^L are four distinct boundary points in counterclockwise order. Consider critical Ising model in $\Omega \cap \mathbb{Z}^2$ with alternating boundary condition: $\oplus$ along the boundary arcs $(x^R y^R)$ and $(y^L x^L)$, and $\ominus$ along the arcs $(x^L x^R)$ and $(y^R y^L)$. With this boundary condition, a pair of interfaces appears naturally. This pair of interfaces connects between the four points x^R, y^R, y^L, x^L and the two interfaces can not cross, see Figure 1.1. The scaling limit of the pair of interfaces, if exists, should satisfy conformal Markov property (see Definition 1.2). This article concerns probability measures on pairs of simple curves with conformal

Markov property, and they should describe scaling limits of pairs of interfaces in critical lattice model with alternating boundary condition in quads.



Figure 1.1: The Ising interface with alternating boundary condition.

In the case of Dobrushin boundary condition, there are two boundary points, and conformal Markov property determines the one-parameter family of random curves SLE_κ. However, in the case of alternating boundary conditions, there are four boundary points, and conformal Markov property is not sufficient to naturally single out random processes. We go back to the critical Ising model. As described before, there is a pair of interfaces when the boundary condition is alternating. The scaling limit of such pair should satisfy conformal Markov property; at the same time, it is clear that the pair of curves also satisfy a particular symmetry (see Definition 1.3). To understand the scaling limit of such pair, it is then natural to require the symmetry as well as conformal Markov property.

It turns out that the combination of conformal Markov property and symmetry determines a two-parameter family of pairs of curves. These curves are *Hypergeometric SLE*s.

1.1 Hypergeometric SLE

Hypergeometric SLEs is a two-parameter family of random curves in quad. The two parameters are $\kappa \in (0,8)$ and $\nu \in \mathbb{R}$, and we denote it by $\mathrm{hSLE}_\kappa(\nu)$. It comes naturally as the scaling limit of interfaces in critical planar models with alternating boundary condition, and it is conformally invariant. We will give definition of this process in Section 3, and the main theorem of Section 3 is continuity and reversibility of Hypergeometric SLEs.

Theorem 1.1. *Fix $\kappa \in (0,8), \nu > (-4) \vee (\kappa/2-6)$, and $x_1 < x_2 < x_3 < x_4$. Let η be the $\mathrm{hSLE}_\kappa(\nu)$ in $\mathbb{H}$ from x_1 to x_4 with marked points (x_2, x_3). The process η is almost surely generated by a continuous transient curve. Moreover, the process η enjoys reversibility for $\nu \geq \kappa/2-4$: the time reversal of η is the $\mathrm{hSLE}_\kappa(\nu)$ in $\mathbb{H}$ from x_4 to x_1 with marked points (x_3, x_2).*

Here we briefly summarize the relation between hSLE and SLE_κ (or $\mathrm{SLE}_\kappa(\rho)$) process. Fix $x_1 = 0 < x_2 < x_3 < x_4 = \infty$. Suppose η is $\mathrm{hSLE}_\kappa(\nu)$ in $\mathbb{H}$ from 0 to ∞ with marked points (x_2, x_3).

- When $\nu = -2$, the law of η equals SLE_κ.
- When $\kappa = 4$, the law of η equals $\mathrm{SLE}_4(\nu+2, -\nu-2)$ with force points (x_2, x_3).

- When $x_3 \to \infty$, the law of η converges weakly to the law of $\mathrm{SLE}_\kappa(\nu+2)$ with force point x_2. See Lemma 3.2.
- When $\kappa \in (4,8)$ and $\nu = \kappa - 6$, the law of η equals the law of SLE_κ conditioned to avoid the interval (x_2, x_3). See Proposition 3.9.

From these relations, we see that $\mathrm{hSLE}_\kappa(\nu)$ is a generalization of $\mathrm{SLE}_\kappa(\rho)$ process. In general, the driving function of hSLE has a drift term which involves a hypergeometric function. When $\kappa = 4$, the hypergeometric term becomes zero, and the process coincides with $\mathrm{SLE}_4(\nu+2, -\nu-2)$ process. See [PW17, Sections 5 and 6] for more discussion on the special case $\kappa = 4$.

1.2 Conformal Markov Characterization of SLE pairs

We denote by $\mathcal{Q}$ the collection of all quads, and for each quad $q = (\Omega; x^R, y^R, y^L, x^L)$, we denote by $X_0(\Omega; x^R, y^R, y^L, x^L)$ the collection of pairs of disjoint simple curves $(\eta^L; \eta^R)$ such that η^R connects x^R and y^R and η^L connects x^L and y^L. The following definitions concern confomral Markov property and symmetry for pairs of simple curves. See also Figure 1.2 for an illustration.

Definition 1.2. *Suppose $(\mathbb{P}_q, q \in \mathcal{Q})$ is a family of probability measures on pairs of disjoint simple curves $(\eta^L; \eta^R) \in X_0(\Omega; x^R, y^R, y^L, x^L)$. We say that $(\mathbb{P}_q, q \in \mathcal{Q})$ satisfies Conformal Markov Property (CMP) if it satisfies the following two properties.*

- *Conformal Invariance. Suppose $q = (\Omega; x^R, y^R, y^L, x^L), \tilde{q} = (\tilde{\Omega}; \tilde{x}^R, \tilde{y}^R, \tilde{y}^L, \tilde{x}^L) \in \mathcal{Q}$, and $\psi : \Omega \to \tilde{\Omega}$ is a conformal map with $\psi(x^R) = \tilde{x}^R, \psi(y^R) = \tilde{y}^R, \psi(y^L) = \tilde{y}^L, \psi(x^L) = \tilde{x}^L$. Then for $(\eta^L; \eta^R) \sim \mathbb{P}_q$, we have $(\psi(\eta^L); \psi(\eta^R)) \sim \mathbb{P}_{\tilde{q}}$.*
- *Domain Markov Property. Suppose $(\eta^L; \eta^R) \sim \mathbb{P}_q$, then for every η^L-stopping time τ^L and η^R-stopping time τ^R, the conditional law of $(\eta^L|_{t \geq \tau^L}; \eta^R|_{t \geq \tau^R})$ given $\eta^L[0, \tau^L]$ and $\eta^R[0, \tau^R]$ is the same as $\mathbb{P}_{q_{\tau^L, \tau^R}}$ where*

$$q_{\tau^L, \tau^R} = (\Omega \setminus (\eta^L[0, \tau^L] \cup \eta^R[0, \tau^R]); \eta^R(\tau^R), y^R, y^L, \eta^L(\tau^L)).$$



Figure 1.2: Suppose the pair $(\eta^L; \eta^R)$ satisfies CMP. For any η^L-stopping time τ^L and any η^R-stopping time τ^R, let φ be a conformal map from $\Omega \setminus (\eta^L[0, \tau^L] \cap \eta^R[0, \tau^R])$ onto a quad $\tilde{q} = (\tilde{\Omega}; \tilde{x}^R, \tilde{y}^R, \tilde{y}^L, \tilde{x}^L)$ such that $\varphi(\eta^R(\tau^R)) = \tilde{x}^R, \varphi(y^R) = \tilde{y}^R, \varphi(y^L) = \tilde{y}^L, \varphi(\eta^L(\tau^L)) = \tilde{x}^L$. Then the conditional law of $(\varphi(\eta^L); \varphi(\eta^R))$ given $\eta^L[0, \tau^L] \cup \eta^R[0, \tau^R]$ is the same as $\mathbb{P}_{\tilde{q}}$.

Definition 1.3. *Suppose $(\mathbb{P}_q, q \in \mathcal{Q})$ is a family of probability measures on pairs of disjoint simple curves $(\eta^L; \eta^R) \in X_0(\Omega; x^R, y^R, y^L, x^L)$. We say that $(\mathbb{P}_q, q \in \mathcal{Q})$ satisfies Symmetry if for all $q = (\Omega; x^R, y^R, y^L, x^L) \in \mathcal{Q}$ the following is true. Suppose $(\eta^L; \eta^R) \sim \mathbb{P}_q$, and $\psi : \Omega \to \Omega$ is the anti-conformal map which swaps x^L, y^L and x^R, y^R, then $(\psi(\eta^R); \psi(\eta^L)) \sim \mathbb{P}_q$.*

It turns out that the combination of CMP and the symmetry determines a two-parameter family of pairs of curves—$\mathrm{hSLE}_\kappa(\nu)$. In Theorem 1.4, we consider pairs of random curves with CMP and the symmetry, and we also require "Condition C1". This is a technical requirement concerning certain regularity of the curves and its definition is in Section 2.3.

Theorem 1.4. *Suppose $(\mathbb{P}_q, q \in \mathcal{Q})$ satisfies CMP in Definition 1.2, Symmetry in Definition 1.3 and Condition C1. Then there exist $\kappa \in (0,4]$ and $\nu < \kappa - 6$ such that, for $q = (\Omega; x^R, y^R, y^L, x^L) \in \mathcal{Q}$ and $(\eta^L; \eta^R) \sim \mathbb{P}_q$, the marginal law of η^R (up to the first hitting time of $[y^R y^L]$) equals $\mathrm{hSLE}_\kappa(\nu)$ in Ω from x^R to x^L with marked points (y^R, y^L) conditioned to hit $[y^R y^L]$ (up to the first hitting time of $[y^R y^L]$).*

Definition 1.3 describes the left-right symmetry. It is also natural to think about top-bottom symmetry, which we call reversibility in Definition 1.5 to distinguish from the symmetry in Definition 1.3. The combination of CMP, Symmetry and Reversibility singles out a one-parameter family of pairs of curves, see Corollary 1.6.

Definition 1.5. *Suppose $(\mathbb{P}_q, q \in \mathcal{Q})$ is a family of probability measures on pairs of disjoint simple curves $(\eta^L; \eta^R) \in X_0(\Omega; x^R, y^R, y^L, x^L)$. We say that $(\mathbb{P}_q, q \in \mathcal{Q})$ satisfies Reversibility if for all $q = (\Omega; x^R, y^R, y^L, x^L) \in \mathcal{Q}$ the following is true. Suppose $(\eta^L; \eta^R) \sim \mathbb{P}_q$, and $\psi : \Omega \to \Omega$ is the anti-conformal map which swaps x^L, x^R and y^L, y^R, then $(\psi(\eta^R); \psi(\eta^L)) \sim \mathbb{P}_q$.*

Corollary 1.6. *Suppose $(\mathbb{P}_q, q \in \mathcal{Q})$ satisfies CMP in Definition 1.2, Symmetry in Definition 1.3, Reversibility in Definition 1.5 and Condition C1. Then there exists $\kappa \in (0,4]$ such that, for any $q = (\Omega; x^R, y^R, y^L, x^L) \in \mathcal{Q}$ and $(\eta^L; \eta^R) \sim \mathbb{P}_q$, the marginal law of η^R equals hSLE_κ in Ω from x^R to y^R with marked points (x^L, y^L).*

1.3 Convergence of Critical Planar Ising Interfaces

Let us go back to the critical Ising model. We take Ising model as an example to explain the interest in pairs of random curves and the motivation for the definition of conformal Markov property and symmetries. We find that the combination of conformal Markov property and symmetries singles out Hypergeometric SLEs. In this section, we point out that Hypergeometric SLE DOES correspond to the scaling limit of critical Ising model with alternating boundary conditions.

Theorem 1.7. *Let discrete domains $(\Omega_\delta; x^R_\delta, y^R_\delta, y^L_\delta, x^L_\delta)$ on the square lattice approximate some quad $q = (\Omega; x^R, y^R, y^L, x^L)$ as $\delta \to 0$. Consider the critical Ising in Ω_δ with the following boundary condition:*

$$\ominus \text{ along } (x^L_\delta x^R_\delta), \quad \oplus \text{ along } (x^R_\delta y^R_\delta) \cup (y^L_\delta x^L_\delta), \quad \xi \in \{\oplus, \text{free}\} \text{ along } (y^R_\delta y^L_\delta).$$

Denote by $\mathcal{C}^{\ominus}_v(q)$ the event that the quad is vertically crossed by $\ominus$ and by $\mathcal{C}^{\oplus}_h(q)$ the event that the quad is horizontally crossed by $\oplus$.

- *Suppose $\xi = \oplus$. On the event $\mathcal{C}^{\ominus}_v(q)$, let η_δ be the interface connecting x^R_δ and y^R_δ. Then the law of η_δ converges weakly to hSLE_3 in Ω from x^R to y^R with marked points (x^L, y^L).*
- *Suppose $\xi =$ free. On the event $\mathcal{C}^{\ominus}_v(q)$, let η_δ be the interface connecting x^R_δ and y^R_δ. Then the law of η_δ (up to the first hitting time of $[y^R_\delta y^L_\delta]$) converges weakly to $\mathrm{hSLE}_3(-7/2)$ in Ω from x^R to x^L conditioned to hit $[y^R y^L]$ (up to the first hitting time of $[y^R y^L]$).*
- *Suppose $\xi =$ free. On the event $\mathcal{C}^{\oplus}_h(q)$, let η_δ be the interface connecting x^R_δ and x^L_δ. Then the law of η_δ converges weakly to $\mathrm{hSLE}_3(-3/2)$ in Ω from x^R to x^L with marked points (y^R, y^L).*

The conclusions in Theorem 1.7 are not new. They were proved by K. Izyurov [Izy15]. However, we will give a new proof for the convergence towards hSLE_3 (see Lemma 5.5) and there are two features on the method developed in Section 5. First, constructing holomorphic observable is the usual way to prove

the convergence of interfaces in the critical lattice model (as in [CS12] and [Izy15]); however, with our method, there is no need to construct new observable. The only input we need is the convergence of the interface with Dobrushin boundary condition. Second, there are many works on multiple SLEs trying to study the scaling limit of interfaces in critical lattice model with alternating boundary conditions, see [Dub07, BBK05, KP16], and their works study the local growth of these interfaces. Whereas, our result is "global". Moreover, the method developed in this paper also works for other lattice models as long as we have the convergence with Doburshin boundary conditions, for instance Loop-Erased Random Walk and level lines of discrete Gaussian Free Field.

Outline and Relation to Previous Works

We will give preliminaries on SLEs in Section 2. Hypergeometric SLEs were previously introduced by D. Zhan [Zha08] and W. Qian [Qia16] with different motivations and different definitions. We will introduce Hypergeometric SLE in Section 3 with our motivation. We will prove Theorem 1.1 in Section 3 and many other interesting properties of hSLE. We prove Theorem 1.4 in Section 4. Finally, we introduce Ising model in Section 5 and prove Theorem 1.7. The conclusions in Theorem 1.7 were first proved in [Izy15], but our proof is new.

Acknowledgment. The author thanks D. Chelkak, K.Izyurov, and S. Smirnov for helpful discussion on critical Ising interfaces. The author thanks V. Beffara and E. Peltola for helpful discussion on multiple SLEs. The author is supported by the NCCR/SwissMAP, the ERC AG COMPASP, the Swiss NSF.

2 Preliminaries

2.1 Space of Curves

A planar curve is a continuous mapping from $[0,1]$ to $\mathbb{C}$ modulo reparameterization. Let X be the set of planar curves. The metric d on X is defined by

$$d(\eta_1,\eta_2)=\inf_{\varphi_1,\varphi_2}\sup_{t\in[0,1]}|\eta_1(\varphi_1(t))-\eta_2(\varphi_2(t))|,$$

where the inf is over increasing homeomorphisms $\varphi_1,\varphi_2:[0,1]\to[0,1]$. The metric space (X,d) is complete and separable. A simple curve is a continuous injective mapping from $[0,1]$ to $\mathbb{C}$ modulo reparameterization. Let X_{simple} be the subspace of simple curves and denote by X_0 its closure. The curves in X_0 may have multiple points but they do not have self-crossings.

We call $(\Omega;x,y)$ a *Dobrushin domain* if Ω is a non-empty simply connected proper subset of $\mathbb{C}$ and x,y are two distinct boundary points. Denote by (xy) the arc of $\partial\Omega$ from x to y counterclockwise. We say that a sequence of Dobrushin domains $(\Omega_\delta;x_\delta,y_\delta)$ converges to a Dobrushin domain $(\Omega;x,y)$ in the *Carathéodory sense* if $f_\delta\to f$ uniformly on any compact subset of $\mathbb{H}$ where f_δ (resp. f) is the unique conformal map from $\mathbb{H}$ to Ω_δ (resp. Ω) satisfying $f_\delta(0)=x_\delta, f_\delta(\infty)=y_\delta$ and $f'_\delta(\infty)=1$ (resp. $f(0)=x, f(\infty)=y, f'(\infty)=1$).

Given a Dobrushin domain $(\Omega;x,y)$, let $X_{\text{simple}}(\Omega;x,y)$ be the space of simple curves η such that

$$\eta(0)=x,\quad \eta(1)=y,\quad \eta(0,1)\subset\Omega.$$

Denote by $X_0(\Omega;x,y)$ the closure of $X_{\text{simple}}(\Omega;x,y)$.

We call $(\Omega;x,w,y)$ a *(topological) triangle* if Ω is a non-empty simply connected proper subset of $\mathbb{C}$ and x,w,y are three boundary points along $\partial\Omega$ in counterclockwise order such that $x\neq y$. Let $\mathcal{T}$ be the collection of all such triangles. We say that a sequence of triangles $(\Omega_\delta;x_\delta,w_\delta,y_\delta)$ converges to a triangle $(\Omega;x,w,y)$ in the *Carathéodory sense* if $f_\delta\to f$ uniformly on any compact subset of $\mathbb{H}$ where f_δ (resp. f) is the unique conformal map from $\mathbb{H}$ to Ω_δ (resp. Ω) satisfying $f_\delta(0)=x_\delta, f_\delta(1)=w_\delta$, and $f_\delta(\infty)=y_\delta$.(resp. $f(0)=x, f(1)=w, f(\infty)=y$).

We call $(\Omega; a, b, c, d)$ a *quad (or topological rectangle)* if Ω a non-empty simply connected proper subset of $\mathbb{C}$ and a, b, c, d are four boundary points in counterclockwise order such that $a \neq d$. Given a quad $(\Omega; a, b, c, d)$, we denote by $d_\Omega((ab), (cd))$ the extremal distance between (ab) and (cd) in Ω. We say a sequence of quads $(\Omega_\delta; a_\delta, b_\delta, c_\delta, d_\delta)$ converges to a quad $(\Omega; a, b, c, d)$ in the *Carathéodory sense* if $f_\delta \to f$ uniformly on any compact subset of $\mathbb{H}$ and $\lim_\delta f_\delta^{-1}(b_\delta) = f^{-1}(b)$ and $\lim_\delta f_\delta^{-1}(c_\delta) = f^{-1}(c)$ where f_δ (resp. f) is the unique conformal map from $\mathbb{H}$ to Ω_δ (resp. Ω) satisfying $f_\delta(0) = a_\delta, f_\delta(\infty) = d_\delta$ and $f'_\delta(\infty) = 1$ (resp. $f(0) = a, f(\infty) = d, f'(\infty) = 1$).

Given a quad $(\Omega; x^L, x^R, y^R, y^L)$, let $X_{\text{simple}}(\Omega; x^L, x^R, y^R, y^L)$ be the collection of pairs of simple curves $(\eta^L; \eta^R)$ such that $\eta^L \in X_{\text{simple}}(\Omega; x^L, y^L)$ and $\eta^R \in X_{\text{simple}}(\Omega; x^R, y^R)$ and that $\eta^L \cap \eta^R = \emptyset$. The definition of $X_0(\Omega; x^L, x^R, y^R, y^L)$ is a little bit complicate. Given a quad $(\Omega; x^L, x^R, y^R, y^L)$ and $\epsilon > 0$, let $X_0^\epsilon(\Omega; x^L, x^R, y^R, y^L)$ be the set of pairs of curves $(\eta^L; \eta^R)$ such that

- $\eta^L \in X_0(\Omega; x^L, y^L)$ and $\eta^R \in X_0(\Omega; x^R, y^R)$;
- $d_{\Omega^L}(\eta^L, (x^R y^R)) \geq \epsilon$ where Ω^L the connected component of $\Omega \setminus \eta^L$ with $(x^R y^R)$ on the boundary, and η^R is contained in the closure of Ω^L ;
- $d_{\Omega^R}(\eta^R, (y^L x^L)) \geq \epsilon$ where Ω^R the connected component of $\Omega \setminus \eta^R$ with $(y^L x^L)$ on the boundary, and η^L is contained in the closure of Ω^R.

Define the metric on $X_0^\epsilon(\Omega; x^L, x^R, y^R, y^L)$ by

$$\mathcal{D}((\eta_1^L, \eta_1^R), (\eta_2^L, \eta_2^R)) = \max\{d(\eta_1^L, \eta_2^L), d(\eta_1^R, \eta_2^R)\}.$$

One can check $\mathcal{D}$ is a metric and the space $X_0^\epsilon(\Omega; x^L, x^R, y^R, y^L)$ with $\mathcal{D}$ is complete and separable. Finally, set

$$X_0(\Omega; x^L, x^R, y^R, y^L) = \bigcup_{\epsilon > 0} X_0^\epsilon(\Omega; x^L, x^R, y^R, y^L).$$

Note that $X_0(\Omega; x^L, x^R, y^R, y^L)$ is no longer complete.

Suppose E is a metric space and $\mathcal{B}_E$ is the Borel σ-field. Let $\mathcal{P}$ be the space of probability measures on $(E, \mathcal{B}_E)$. The Prohorov metric $d_\mathcal{P}$ on $\mathcal{P}$ is defined by

$$d_\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{P}_1, \mathbb{P}_2) = \inf\left\{\epsilon > 0 : \mathbb{P}_1[A] \leq \mathbb{P}_2[A^\epsilon] + \epsilon, \mathbb{P}_2[A] \leq \mathbb{P}_1[A^\epsilon] + \epsilon, \forall A \in \mathcal{B}_E\right\}.$$

When E is complete and separable, the space $\mathcal{P}$ is complete and separable ([Bil99, Theorem 6.8]); moreover, a sequence $\mathbb{P}_n$ in $\mathcal{P}$ converges weakly to $\mathbb{P}$ if and only if $d_\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{P}_n, \mathbb{P}) \to 0$.

Let Σ be a family of probability measures on $(E, \mathcal{B}_E)$. We call Σ *relatively compact* if every sequence of elements in Σ contains a weakly convergent subsequence. We call Σ *tight* if, for every $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a compact set K_ϵ such that $\mathbb{P}[K_\epsilon] \geq 1 - \epsilon$ for all $\mathbb{P} \in \Sigma$. By Prohorov's Theorem ([Bil99, Theorem 5.2]), when E is complete and separable, relative compactness is equivalent to tightness.

2.2 Loewner Chain and SLE

We call a compact subset K of $\overline{\mathbb{H}}$ an $\mathbb{H}$-*hull* if $\mathbb{H} \setminus K$ is simply connected. Riemann's Mapping Theorem asserts that there exists a unique conformal map g_K from $\mathbb{H} \setminus K$ onto $\mathbb{H}$ such that $\lim_{z \to \infty} |g_K(z) - z| = 0$. We call such g_K the conformal map from $\mathbb{H} \setminus K$ onto $\mathbb{H}$ normalized at ∞ and we call $a(K) := \lim_{z \to \infty} z(g_t(z) - z)$ the *half-plane capacity* of K.

Loewner chain is a collection of $\mathbb{H}$-hulls $(K_t, t \geq 0)$ associated with the family of conformal maps $(g_t, t \geq 0)$ obtained by solving the Loewner equation: for each $z \in \mathbb{H}$,

$$\partial_t g_t(z) = \frac{2}{g_t(z) - W_t}, \quad g_0(z) = z,$$

where $(W_t, t \geq 0)$ is a one-dimensional continuous function which we call the driving function. Let T_z be the *swallowing time* of z defined as $\sup\{t \geq 0 : \min_{s\in[0,t]} |g_s(z) - W_s| > 0\}$. Let $K_t := \overline{\{z \in \mathbb{H} : T_z \leq t\}}$. Then g_t is the unique conformal map from $H_t := \mathbb{H}\backslash K_t$ onto $\mathbb{H}$ normalized at ∞. Since the half-plane capacity of K_t is $2t$ for all $t \geq 0$, we say that the process $(K_t, t \geq 0)$ is parameterized by the half-plane capacity. We say that $(K_t, t \geq 0)$ can be generated by the continuous curve $(\eta(t), t \geq 0)$ if for any t, the unbounded connected component of $\mathbb{H} \setminus \eta[0, t]$ coincides with $H_t = \mathbb{H} \setminus K_t$.

Indeed, continuous simple curve under mild constraints does solve the Loewner equation with continuous driving function. Suppose $T \in (0, \infty]$ and $\eta : [0, T) \to \overline{\mathbb{H}}$ is a continuous simple curve with $\eta(0) = 0$. Assume η satisfies the following: for every $t \in (0, T)$,

- $\eta(t, T)$ is contained in the closure of the unbounded connected component of $\mathbb{H} \setminus \eta[0, t]$ and
- $\eta^{-1}(\eta[0, t] \cup \mathbb{R})$ has empty interior in (t, T).

For each $t > 0$, let g_t be the conformal map which maps the unbounded connected component of $\mathbb{H} \setminus \eta[0, t]$ onto $\mathbb{H}$ normalized at ∞. After reparameterization, $(g_t, t \geq 0)$ solves the above Loewner equation with continuous driving function [Law05, Section 4.1].

Here we discuss the evolution of a point $y \in \mathbb{R}$ under g_t. We assume $y \geq 0$. There are two possibilities: if y is not swallowed by K_t, then we define $Y_t = g_t(y)$; if y is swallowed by K_t, then we define Y_t to be the image of the rightmost of point of $K_t \cap \mathbb{R}$ under g_t. Suppose that $(K_t, t \geq 0)$ is generated by a continuous path $(\eta(t), t \geq 0)$ and that the Lebesgue measure of $\eta[0, \infty] \cap \mathbb{R}$ is zero. Then the process Y_t is uniquely characterized by the following equation:

$$Y_t = y + \int_0^t \frac{2ds}{Y_s - W_s}, \quad Y_t \geq W_t, \quad \forall t \geq 0.$$

In this paper, we may write $g_t(y)$ for the process Y_t.

Schramm Loewner Evolution SLE_κ is the random Loewner chain $(K_t, t \geq 0)$ driven by $W_t = \sqrt{\kappa}B_t$ where $(B_t, t \geq 0)$ is a standard one-dimensional Brownian motion. In [RS05], the authors prove that $(K_t, t \geq 0)$ is almost surely generated by a continuous transient curve, i.e. there almost surely exists a continuous curve η such that for each $t \geq 0$, H_t is the unbounded connected component of $\mathbb{H}\backslash\eta[0, t]$ and that $\lim_{t\to\infty} |\eta(t)| = \infty$. There are phase transitions at $\kappa = 4$ and $\kappa = 8$: SLE_κ are simple curves when $\kappa \in (0, 4]$; they have self-touching when $\kappa \in (4, 8)$; and they are space-filling when $\kappa \geq 8$.

It is clear that SLE_κ is scaling invariant, thus we can define SLE_κ in any Dobrushin domain $(\Omega; x, y)$ via conformal image: let ϕ be a conformal map from $\mathbb{H}$ onto Ω that sends 0 to x and ∞ to y, then define $\phi(\eta)$ to be SLE_κ in Ω from x to y. For $\kappa \in (0, 8)$, the curves SLE_κ enjoys *reversibility*: let η be an SLE_κ in Ω from x to y, then the time-reversal of η has the same law as SLE_κ in Ω from y to x. The reversibility for $\kappa \in (0, 4]$ was proved in [Zha08], and it was proved for $\kappa \in (4, 8)$ in [MS16c].

2.3 Convergence of Curves

In this section, we first recall the main result of [KS17] and then show a similar result for pairs of curves. Suppose $(Q; a, b, c, d)$ is a quad. We say that a curve η *crosses* Q if there exists a subinterval $[s, t]$ such that $\eta(s, t) \subset Q$ and $\eta[s, t]$ intersects both (ab) and (cd). Fix a Dobrushin domain $(\Omega; x, y)$, for any curve η in $X_0(\Omega; x, y)$ and any time τ, define Ω_τ to be the connected component of $\Omega \setminus \eta[0, \tau]$ with y on the boundary. Consider a quad $(Q; a, b, c, d)$ in Ω_τ such that (bc) and (da) are contained in $\partial\Omega_\tau$. We say that Q is *avoidable* if it does not disconnect $\eta(\tau)$ from y in Ω_τ.

Definition 2.1. *A family Σ of probability measures on curves in $X_{\mathrm{simple}}(\Omega; x, y)$ is said to satisfy **Condition C2** if, for any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a constant $c(\epsilon) > 0$ such that for any $\mathbb{P} \in \Sigma$, any stopping time τ, and any avoidable quad $(Q; a, b, c, d)$ in Ω_τ such that $d_Q((ab), (cd)) \geq c(\epsilon)$, we have*

$$\mathbb{P}[\eta[\tau, 1] \text{ crosses } Q \,|\, \eta[0, \tau]] \leq 1 - \epsilon.$$

*If the above property holds for $\tau = 0$, we say that the family satisfies **Condition C1**.*

It is clear that the combination of Condition C1 and CMP implies Condition C2.

Theorem 2.2. *[KS17, Corollary 1.7, Proposition 2.6]. Fix a Dobrushin domain $(\Omega; x, y)$. Suppose that $(\eta_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is a sequence of curves in $X_{\text{simple}}(\Omega; x, y)$ satisfying Condition C2. Denote by $(W_n(t), t \geq 0)$ the driving process of η_n. Then*

- *the family $(W_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is tight in the metrisable space of continuous functions on $[0,\infty)$ with the topology of uniform convergence on compact subsets of $[0,\infty)$;*
- *the family $(\eta_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is tight in the space of curves X;*
- *the family $(\eta_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$, when each curve is parameterized by the half-plane capacity, is tight in the metrisable space of continuous functions on $[0,\infty)$ with the topology of uniform convergence on compact subsets of $[0,\infty)$.*

Moreover, if the sequence converges in any of the topologies above it also converges in the two other topologies and the limits agree in the sense that the limiting random curve is driven by the limiting driving function.

Next, we will explain a similar result for pairs of curves. Fix a quad $(\Omega; x^L, x^R, y^R, y^L)$.

Definition 2.3. *A family Σ of probability measures on pairs of curves in $X_{\text{simple}}(\Omega; x^L, x^R, y^R, y^L)$ is said to satisfy **Condition C2** if, for any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a constant $c(\epsilon) > 0$ such that for any $\mathbb{P} \in \Sigma$, the following holds. Given any η^L-stopping time τ^L and any η^R-stopping time τ^R, and any avoidable quad $(Q^R; a^R, b^R, c^R, d^R)$ for η^R in $\Omega \setminus (\eta^L[0,\tau^L] \cup \eta^R[0,\tau^R])$ such that $d_{Q^R}((a^R b^R), (c^R d^R)) \geq c(\epsilon)$, and any avoidable quad $(Q^L; a^L, b^L, c^L, d^L)$ for η^L in $\Omega\setminus(\eta^L[0,\tau^L]\cup\eta^R[0,\tau^R])$ such that $d_{Q^L}((a^L b^L), (c^L d^L)) \geq c(\epsilon)$, we have*

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\eta^R[\tau^R, 1] \text{ crosses } Q^R \,|\, \eta^L[0,\tau^L], \eta^R[0,\tau^R]\right] \leq 1-\epsilon,$$

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\eta^L[\tau^L, 1] \text{ crosses } Q^L \,|\, \eta^L[0,\tau^L], \eta^R[0,\tau^R]\right] \leq 1-\epsilon.$$

*If the above property holds for $\tau^L = \tau^R = 0$, we say that the family satisfies **Condition C1**.*

Theorem 2.4. *Suppose that $\{(\eta_n^L; \eta_n^R)\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is a sequence of pairs of curves in $X_{\text{simple}}(\Omega; x^L, x^R, y^R, y^L)$ and denote their laws by $\{\mathbb{P}_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$. Let Ω_n^L be the connected component of $\Omega \setminus \eta_n^L$ with $(x^R y^R)$ on the boundary and Ω_n^R be the connected component of $\Omega \setminus \eta_n^R$ with $(y^L x^L)$ on the boundary. Define, for each n,*

$$\mathcal{D}_n^L = d_{\Omega_n^L}(\eta_n^L, (x^R y^R)), \quad \mathcal{D}_n^R = d_{\Omega_n^R}(\eta_n^R, (y^L x^L)).$$

Assume that the family $\{(\eta_n^L; \eta_n^R)\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ satisfies Condition C2 and that the sequence of random variables $\{(\mathcal{D}_n^L; \mathcal{D}_n^R)\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is tight in the following sense: for any $u > 0$, there exists $\epsilon > 0$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}_n\left[\mathcal{D}_n^L \geq \epsilon, \mathcal{D}_n^R \geq \epsilon\right] \geq 1-u, \quad \forall n.$$

Then the sequence $\{(\eta_n^L; \eta_n^R)\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is relatively compact in $X_0(\Omega; x^L, x^R, y^R, y^L)$.

Proof. By Theorem 2.2, we know that there is subsequence $n_k \to \infty$ such that $\eta_{n_k}^L$ (resp. $\eta_{n_k}^R$) converges weakly in all three topologies in Theorem 2.2. By Skorohod Represnetation Theorem, we could couple all $(\eta_{n_k}^L; \eta_{n_k}^R)$ in a common space so that $\eta_{n_k}^L \to \eta^L$ and $\eta_{n_k}^R \to \eta^R$ almost surely. For $\epsilon > 0$, define

$$K_\epsilon = \left\{(\eta^L; \eta^R) \in X_{\text{simple}}(\Omega; x^L, x^R, y^R, y^L) : d_{\Omega^L}(\eta^L, (x^R y^R)) \geq \epsilon, d_{\Omega^R}(\eta^R, (y^L x^L)) \geq \epsilon\right\}.$$

From the assumption, we know that, for any $u > 0$, there exists $\epsilon > 0$ such that $\inf_n \mathbb{P}_n[K_\epsilon] \geq 1-u$. Therefore, with probability at least $1-u$, the sequence $(\eta_{n_k}^L; \eta_{n_k}^R)$ converges to $(\eta^L; \eta^R)$ in $X_0^\epsilon(\Omega; x^L, x^R, y^R, y^L) \subset X_0(\Omega; x^L, x^R, y^R, y^L)$. This is true for any $u > 0$, thus we have $(\eta_{n_k}^L; \eta_{n_k}^R)$ converges to $(\eta^L; \eta^R)$ in $X_0(\Omega; x^L, x^R, y^R, y^L)$ almost surely. □

2.4 Conformal Markov Characterization of $\mathrm{SLE}_\kappa(\rho)$

$\mathrm{SLE}_\kappa(\rho)$ *processes* are variants of SLE_κ where one keeps track of one extra point on the boundary. $\mathrm{SLE}_\kappa(\rho)$ process with force point $w \in \mathbb{R}$ is the Loewner evolution driven by W_t which is the solution to the system of integrated SDEs:

$$W_t = \sqrt{\kappa}B_t + \int_0^t \frac{\rho ds}{W_s - V_s}, \quad V_t = w + \int_0^t \frac{2ds}{V_s - W_s},$$

where B_t is one-dimensional Brownian motion. For $\rho \in \mathbb{R}$, the process is well-defined up to the first time that w is swallowed. When $\rho > -2$, the process is well-defined for all time and it is generated by continuous transient curve. Assume $w \geq 0$, when $\rho \geq \kappa/2 - 2$, the curve never hits the interval $[w, \infty)$; when $\rho < \kappa/2 - 2$, the curve hits the interval $[w, \infty)$ at finite time; and when $\rho \leq \kappa/2 - 4$, the curve accumulates at the point w almost surely. Since the the process is conformal invariant, we can define $\mathrm{SLE}_\kappa(\rho)$ in any triangle via conformal image.

Lemma 2.5. *Fix $\kappa \in (0, 8)$ and $\rho > (-2) \vee (\kappa/2 - 4)$. Then $\mathrm{SLE}_\kappa(\rho)$ satisfies Condition C1.*

Proof. Suppose η is an $\mathrm{SLE}_\kappa(\rho)$ in $\mathbb{H}$ from 0 to ∞ with force point $w \in \mathbb{R}$. Then there exists a function $p(\delta) \to 0$ as $\delta \to 0$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}[\eta \text{ hits } B(1, \delta)] \leq p(\delta), \tag{2.1}$$

and that p depends only on κ, ρ and is uniform over w, see for instance [Wu16, Lemma 6.4].

Suppose $(Q; a, b, c, d)$ is an avoidable quad for η. It is explained in [KS17, Proof of Theorem 1.10, Equation (12)] that $\{\eta \text{ crosses } Q\}$ implies $\{\eta \text{ hits } B(u, r)\}$ for some $u \in \mathbb{R}, r > 0$ such that

$$\frac{r}{|u|} = \left(\frac{\exp(\pi d_Q((ab), (cd)))}{16} - 1 \right)^{-1}.$$

Combining with (2.1), we see that η satisfies Condition C1. □

Lemma 2.6. *[SW05, Theorem 3]. Fix $\kappa > 0$ and $\rho \in \mathbb{R}$. Fix a triangle $(\Omega; x, w, y)$, let η be an $\mathrm{SLE}_\kappa(\rho)$ in Ω from x to y with force point w. Then η has the same law as $\mathrm{SLE}_\kappa(\kappa - 6 - \rho)$ in Ω from x to w with force point y, up to the first time that the curve disconnects w from y.*

Next, we explain the conformal Markov characterization of $\mathrm{SLE}_\kappa(\rho)$ derived in [MS16b]. Recall that $\mathcal{T}$ is the collection of all triangles.

Definition 2.7. *Suppose $(\mathbb{P}_c, c \in \mathcal{T})$ is a family of probability measures on continuous curves from x to y in Ω. We say that $(\mathbb{P}_c, c \in \mathcal{T})$ satisfies Conformal Markov Property (CMP) if it satisfies the following two properties.*

- *Conformal Invariance. Suppose that $c = (\Omega; x, w, y), \tilde{c} = (\tilde{\Omega}; \tilde{x}, \tilde{w}, \tilde{y}) \in \mathcal{T}$, and $\psi : \Omega \to \tilde{\Omega}$ is the conformal map with $\psi(x) = \tilde{x}, \psi(w) = \tilde{w}, \psi(y) = \tilde{y}$. Then for $\eta \sim \mathbb{P}_c$, we have $\psi(\eta) \sim \mathbb{P}_{\tilde{c}}$.*
- *Domain Markov Property. Suppose $\eta \sim \mathbb{P}_c$, then for every η-stopping time τ, the conditional law of $(\eta|_{t \geq \tau})$ given $\eta[0, \tau]$ is the same as $\mathbb{P}_{c_\tau}$ where $c_\tau = (\Omega_\tau; \eta(\tau), w_\tau, y)$. Here Ω_τ is the connected component of $\Omega \setminus \eta[0, \tau]$ with y on the boundary, and $w_\tau = w$ if w is not swallowed by $\eta[0, \tau]$ and w_τ is the last point of $\eta[0, \tau] \cap (xy)$ if w is swallowed by $\eta[0, \tau]$.*

Theorem 2.8. *[MS16b, Theorem 1.4]. Suppose $(\mathbb{P}_c, c \in \mathcal{T})$ satisfies CMP in Definition 2.7 and Condition C1, then there exist $\kappa \in (0, 8)$ and $\rho > (-2) \vee (\kappa/2 - 4)$ such that, for each $c = (\Omega; x, w, y) \in \mathcal{T}$, $\mathbb{P}_c$ is the law of $\mathrm{SLE}_\kappa(\rho)$ in Ω from x to y with force point w.*

In [MS16b, Theorem 1.4], the authors did not require Condition C1; instead, they required the assumption that, when $\partial\Omega$ is smooth, the Lebesgue measure of $\eta \cap \partial\Omega$ is zero almost surely. Note that Condition C1 implies this latter assumption, and we find Condition C1 is more natural, since it is the continuum counterpart of RSW for critical lattice model.

2.5 SLE with multiple force points

$\mathrm{SLE}_\kappa(\underline{\rho})$ *processes* are variants of SLE_κ where one keeps track of multiple points on the boundary. Suppose $\underline{y} = (0 \le y_1 < y_2 < \cdots < y_n)$ and $\underline{\rho} = (\rho_1, \ldots, \rho_n)$ with $\rho_i \in \mathbb{R}$. An $\mathrm{SLE}_\kappa(\underline{\rho})$ process with force points $\underline{y}$ is the Loewner evolution driven by W_t which is the solution to the following system of integrated SDEs:

$$W_t = \sqrt{\kappa} B_t + \sum_{i=1}^{n} \int_0^t \frac{\rho_i ds}{W_s - V_s^i}, \quad V_t^i = y_i + \int_0^t \frac{2ds}{V_s^i - W_s}, \quad \text{for } 1 \le i \le n,$$

where B_t is an one-dimensional Brownian motion. Note that the process V_t^i is the time evolution of the point y_i, and we may write $g_t(y_i)$ for V_t^i. We define the *continuation threshold* of the $\mathrm{SLE}_\kappa(\underline{\rho})$ to be the infimum of the time t for which

$$\sum_{i: V_t^i = W_t} \rho_i \le -2.$$

By [MS16a], the $\mathrm{SLE}_\kappa(\underline{\rho})$ process is well-defined up to the continuation threshold, and it is almost surely generated by a continuous curve up to and including the continuation threshold.

Lemma 2.9. *[SW05]. The process* $\mathrm{SLE}_\kappa(\underline{\rho})$ *with force points* $\underline{y}$ *is the same as* SLE_κ *process weighted by the following local martingale, up to the first time that* y_1 *is swallowed:*

$$M_t = \prod_{1 \le i \le n} \left(g_t'(y_i)^{\rho_i(\rho_i + 4 - \kappa)/(4\kappa)} (g_t(y_i) - W_t)^{\rho_i/\kappa} \right) \times \prod_{1 \le i < j \le n} (g_t(y_j) - g_t(y_i))^{\rho_i \rho_j / (2\kappa)}.$$

3 Hypergeometric SLE: Continuity and Reversibility

3.1 Definition of hSLE

Fix $\kappa \in (0, 8)$ and $\nu \in \mathbb{R}$, and four boundary points $x_1 < x_2 < x_3 < x_4$. We first define function F which is a solution to the following Euler's hypergeometric differential equation

$$z(1-z)F''(z) + \left(\frac{2\nu + 8}{\kappa} - \frac{2\nu + 2\kappa}{\kappa} z \right) F'(z) - \frac{2(\nu+2)(\kappa - 4)}{\kappa^2} F(z) = 0. \tag{3.1}$$

When $\kappa \in (0, 8)$ and $\nu > (-4) \vee (\kappa/2 - 6)$, define F to be the hypergeometric function (see Section 6):

$$F(z) := {}_2\mathrm{F}_1 \left(\frac{2\nu + 4}{\kappa}, 1 - \frac{4}{\kappa}, \frac{2\nu + 8}{\kappa}; z \right). \tag{3.2}$$

Lemma 3.1. *When* $\kappa \in (0, 8)$ *and* $\nu > (-4) \vee (\kappa/2 - 6)$*, the function* F *defined in* (3.2) *is monotone for* $z \in [0, 1]$*. In particular, for all* $z \in [0, 1]$*,*

$$0 < 1 \wedge F(1) \le F(z) \le 1 \vee F(1) < \infty.$$

Proof. Denote by

$$A = \frac{2\nu + 4}{\kappa}, \quad B = 1 - \frac{4}{\kappa}, \quad C = \frac{2\nu + 8}{\kappa}.$$

Since $C > 0, C > A, C > B$ and $C > A + B$, we know that $F(1) \in (0, \infty)$ by (6.1). Thus we only need to show that F is monotone. If $AB > 0$, then F is increasing by Lemma 6.1. If $AB = 0$, we have $F \equiv 1$.

In the following, we assume $AB < 0$. First assume $B < 0 < A$, i.e. $\kappa < 4$ and $\nu > -2$. There exists $n \in \{1, 2, \ldots\}$ such that $1 > B + n \ge 0$. In other words, $4/\kappa > n \ge 4/\kappa - 1$. By [AS92, Eq. (15.2.2)], we have

$$F^{(n)}(z) = \frac{(A)_n (B)_n}{(C)_n} \, {}_2\mathrm{F}_1(A + n, B + n, C + n; z).$$

Since $A+n\geq 0, B+n\geq 0, C+n\geq 0$, we have ${}_2\mathrm{F}_1(A+n,B+n,C+n;z)\geq 1$. Moreover

$$C=A+B+\frac{8}{\kappa}-1>A+B+n-1.$$

and thus ${}_2\mathrm{F}_1(A+j,B+j,C+j;1)\in(0,\infty)$ for $0\leq j\leq n-1$. If n is even, we have $F^{(n)}(z)\geq 0$. Thus $F^{(n-1)}(\cdot)$ is increasing. In particular,

$$F^{(n-1)}(z)\leq F^{(n-1)}(1)=\frac{(A)_{n-1}(B)_{n-1}}{(C)_{n-1}}\,{}_2\mathrm{F}_1(A+n-1,B+n-1,C+n-1;1)\leq 0.$$

Thus $F^{(n-2)}(\cdot)$ is decreasing and $F^{(n-2)}(z)\geq F^{(n-2)}(1)\geq 0$. In this way, we could argue that $F^{(n-j)}(\cdot)$ is decreasing for even j and it is increasing for odd j. In particular, F is decreasing.

If n is odd, we have $F^{(n)}(z)\leq 0$. Thus $F^{(n-1)}(\cdot)$ is decreasing, and thus

$$F^{(n-1)}(z)\geq F^{(n-1)}(1)=\frac{(A)_{n-1}(B)_{n-1}}{(C)_{n-1}}\,{}_2\mathrm{F}_1(A+n-1,B+n-1,C+n-1;1)\geq 0.$$

Thus $F^{(n-2)}(\cdot)$ is increasing, and in particular $F^{(n-2)}(z)\geq 1$. In this way, we could argue that $F^{(n-j)}(\cdot)$ is increasing for even j and it is decreasing for odd j. In particular, F is decreasing.

Next assume $A<0<B$, i.e. $\kappa\in(4,8)$ and $-2>\nu>\kappa/2-6$. There exists $n\in\{1,2,\ldots\}$ such that $1>A+n\geq 0$. In other words, $1-(2\nu+4)/\kappa>n\geq(2\nu+4)/\kappa$. Since $A+n\geq 0, B+n\geq 0, C+n\geq 0$, we have ${}_2\mathrm{F}_1(A+n,B+n,C+n;z)\geq 1$. Moreover, since $\nu>\kappa/2-6$, we have

$$C=A+B+\frac{8}{\kappa}-1>A+B+n-1,$$

and thus ${}_2\mathrm{F}_1(A+j,B+j,C+j;1)\in(0,\infty)$ for $0\leq j\leq n-1$. We can repeat the same argument as above, and we see that F is decreasing. □

When $\kappa\in(0,8)$ and $\nu\leq(-4)\vee(\kappa/2-6)$, define F to be the following:

$$F(z):=(1-z)^{8/\kappa-1}G(1-z),\quad\text{where}\quad G(z)={}_2\mathrm{F}_1\left(\frac{2\nu+12-\kappa}{\kappa},\frac{4}{\kappa},\frac{8}{\kappa};z\right).\tag{3.3}$$

Note that the function F defined in both (3.2) and (3.3) are solutions to (3.1). By a similar argument as in Lemma 3.1, the function $G(z)$ is uniformly bounded for $z\in[0,1]$ by $G(0)=1$ and $G(1)\in(0,\infty)$.

Set

$$h=\frac{6-\kappa}{2\kappa},\quad a=\frac{\nu+2}{\kappa},\quad b=\frac{(\nu+2)(\nu+6-\kappa)}{4\kappa}.\tag{3.4}$$

Define partition function

$$\mathcal{Z}_{\kappa,\nu}(x_1,x_2,x_3,x_4)=(x_4-x_1)^{-2h}(x_3-x_2)^{-2b}z^aF(z),\quad\text{where}\quad z=\frac{(x_2-x_1)(x_4-x_3)}{(x_3-x_1)(x_4-x_2)}.\tag{3.5}$$

Since $\mathcal{Z}_{\kappa,\nu}$ is conformal covariant under Möbius maps of $\mathbb{H}$, we could define partition function for any quad $q=(\Omega;x_1,x_2,x_3,x_4)$ via conformal image:

$$\mathcal{Z}_{\kappa,\nu}(\Omega;x_1,x_2,x_3,x_4)=\varphi'(x_1)^h\varphi'(x_2)^b\varphi'(x_3)^b\varphi'(x_4)^h\mathcal{Z}_{\kappa,\nu}(\varphi(x_1),\varphi(x_2),\varphi(x_3),\varphi(x_4)),\tag{3.6}$$

where φ is any conformal map from Ω onto $\mathbb{H}$ such that $\varphi(x_1)<\varphi(x_2)<\varphi(x_3)<\varphi(x_4)$.

The process $\mathrm{hSLE}_\kappa(\nu)$ in $\mathbb{H}$ from x_1 to x_4 with marked points (x_2,x_3) is the Loewner chain driven by W_t which is the solution to the following SDEs:

$$dW_t=\sqrt{\kappa}dB_t+\kappa(\partial_{x_1}\log\mathcal{Z}_{\kappa,\nu})(W_t,g_t(x_2),g_t(x_3),g_t(x_4))dt,\quad\partial_t g_t(x_i)=\frac{2}{g_t(x_i)-W_t},\quad\text{for } i=2,3,4.$$

In particular, this implies that the law of η is the same as SLE_κ in $\mathbb{H}$ from x_1 to ∞ weighted by the following local martingale:

$$M_t = g_t'(x_2)^b g_t'(x_3)^b g_t'(x_4)^h \mathcal{Z}_{\kappa,\nu}(W_t, g_t(x_2), g_t(x_3), g_t(x_4)). \tag{3.7}$$

It is clear that the process hSLE is well-defined up to the swallowing time of x_2. We will show that the process is well-defined for all time when $\nu > (-4) \vee (\kappa/2-6)$ in Section 3.2, and that the process is well-defined up to the swallowing time of x_2 when $\nu \le (-4) \vee (\kappa/2-6)$ in Section 3.4. In the following lemma, we explain the relation between $\mathrm{hSLE}_\kappa(\nu)$ and $\mathrm{SLE}_\kappa(\rho)$.

Lemma 3.2. *Fix $\kappa \in (0,8), \nu \in \mathbb{R}$ and assume $x_1 < x_2 < x_3 < x_4$. When $x_3 \to x_4$, the process $\mathrm{hSLE}_\kappa(\nu+2)$ in $\mathbb{H}$ from x_1 to x_4 with marked points (x_2, x_3) converges weakly to $\mathrm{SLE}_\kappa(\nu+2)$ in $\mathbb{H}$ from x_1 to x_4 with force point x_2.*

Proof. Let η be the $\mathrm{hSLE}_\kappa(\nu)$ in $\mathbb{H}$. Let $\tilde{\eta}$ be the $\mathrm{SLE}_\kappa(\nu+2, \kappa-6-\nu, \kappa-6)$ in $\mathbb{H}$ from x_1 to ∞ with force points (x_2, x_3, x_4). We denote by $X_{j1} = g_t(x_j) - W_t$ for $j = 2,3,4$ and $X_{ji} = g_t(x_j) - g_t(x_i)$ for $2 \le i < j \le 4$, and $z_t = X_{21}X_{43}/(X_{31}X_{42})$. By Lemma 2.9 and (3.7), we know that the law of η is the same as the law of $\tilde{\eta}$ weighted by R_t/R_0 where

$$R_t = X_{31}^{(\nu+6-\kappa)/\kappa} X_{41}^{2h} X_{32}^{b} X_{42}^{(\nu+2)h} X_{43}^{(\kappa-6-\nu)h} \left(\frac{X_{43}}{X_{31}X_{42}}\right)^a F(z_t).$$

where F is the hypergeometric function in (3.2) or (3.3). Suppose τ_r is the first time that $\tilde{\eta}$ exits the ball $B(0,r)$. Fix r, let $x_4 \to \infty$ and then $x_3 \to \infty$, we see that $z_0, z_{\tau_r} \to 0$. Furthermore, $R_{\tau_r}/R_0 \to 1$ and R_{τ_r}/R_0 is uniformly bounded. This implies the conclusion. □

In the rest of the paper, we will write hSLE_κ for $\mathrm{hSLE}_\kappa(0)$ with $\nu = 0$.

3.2 Continuity of hSLE: $\nu > (-4) \vee (\kappa/2-6)$

To derive the continuity of the process, it is more convenient to work with hSLE in $\mathbb{H}$ from 0 to ∞. When $\kappa \in (0,8), \nu > (-4) \vee (\kappa/2-6)$, the function $F(z)$ defined in (3.2) is uniformly bounded for $z \in [0,1]$ between $F(0) = 1$ and $F(1) \in (0,\infty)$. The process $\mathrm{hSLE}_\kappa(\nu)$ in $\mathbb{H}$ from 0 to ∞ with marked points (x,y) is the random Loewner chain driven by W which is the solution to the following system of SDEs:

$$\begin{aligned} dW_t &= \sqrt{\kappa} dB_t + \frac{(\nu+2)dt}{W_t - V_t^x} + \frac{-(\nu+2)dt}{W_t - V_t^y} - \kappa \frac{F'(Z_t)}{F(Z_t)} \left(\frac{1-Z_t}{V_t^y - W_t}\right) dt, \\ dV_t^x &= \frac{2dt}{V_t^x - W_t}, \quad dV_t^y = \frac{2dt}{V_t^y - W_t}, \quad \text{where} \quad Z_t = \frac{V_t^x - W_t}{V_t^y - W_t}, \end{aligned} \tag{3.8}$$

where B_t is one-dimensional Brownian motion, and the initial values are $W_0 = 0$, $V_0^x = x$ and $V_0^y = y$.

Proposition 3.3. *Fix $\kappa \in (0,8), \nu > (-4) \vee (\kappa/2-6)$ and $0 < x < y$. The $\mathrm{hSLE}_\kappa(\nu)$ in $\mathbb{H}$ from 0 to ∞ with marked points (x,y) is well-defined for all time and it is almost surely generated by a continuous transient curve. Moreover, it never hits the interval $[x,y]$ when $\nu \ge \kappa/2-4$.*

Before proving Proposition 3.3, let us compare $\mathrm{hSLE}_\kappa(\nu)$ with $\mathrm{SLE}_\kappa(\nu+2, \kappa-6-\nu)$ process. By Girsanov's Theorem, one can check that the law of $\mathrm{hSLE}_\kappa(\nu)$ with marked points (x,y) is the same as the law of $\mathrm{SLE}_\kappa(\nu+2, \kappa-6-\nu)$ with force points (x,y) weighted by R_t/R_0 where

$$R_t = F(Z_t) \left(g_t(y) - W_t\right)^{4/\kappa - 1}, \quad \text{where} \quad Z_t = \frac{g_t(x) - W_t}{g_t(y) - W_t}.$$

Note that $0 \le Z_t \le 1$ for all t and $F(z)$ is bounded for $z \in [0,1]$. Let T_y be the swallowing time of y and define, for $n \ge 1$,

$$S_n = \inf\{t : g_t(y) - W_t \le 1/n \text{ or } g_t(y) - W_t \ge n\}.$$

Then we see that R_{S_n} is bounded. Therefore, the law of $\mathrm{hSLE}_\kappa(\nu)$ is absolutely continuous with respect to the law of $\mathrm{SLE}_\kappa(\nu+2,\kappa-6-\nu)$ up to S_n. Since $\mathrm{SLE}_\kappa(\nu+2,\kappa-6-\nu)$ is generated by a continuous curve up to T_y and it does not hit the interval $[x,y)$ when $\nu \geq \kappa/2-4$, we know that $\mathrm{hSLE}_\kappa(\nu)$ is generated by a continuous curve up to S_n and it does not hit the interval $[x,y)$ up to S_n when $\nu \geq \kappa/2-4$. Let $n \to \infty$, we see that $\mathrm{hSLE}_\kappa(\nu)$ is generated by continuous curve up to $T_y = \lim_n S_n$ and it does not hit the interval $[x,y)$ up to T_y when $\nu \geq \kappa/2-4$.

Note that the absolute continuity of $\mathrm{hSLE}_\kappa(\nu)$ with respect to $\mathrm{SLE}_\kappa(\nu+2,\kappa-6-\nu)$ is not preserved as $n \to \infty$, since R_t may be no longer bounded away from 0 or ∞ as $t \to T_y$. The following lemma discusses the behavior of $\mathrm{hSLE}_\kappa(\nu)$ as $t \to T_y$.

Lemma 3.4. *When $\kappa \in (0,8)$ and $\nu > (-4) \vee (\kappa/2-6)$, the $\mathrm{hSLE}_\kappa(\nu)$ is well-defined and is generated by continuous curve up to and including the swallowing time of y, denoted by T_y. Moreover, the curve does not hit the interval $[x,y]$ if $\nu \geq \kappa/2-4$; and $T_y = \infty$ when $\kappa \leq 4$; and the curve accumulates at a point in the interval (y,∞) as $t \to T_y < \infty$ when $\kappa \in (4,8)$.*

Proof. Since $\mathrm{hSLE}_\kappa(\nu)$ is scaling invariant, we may assume $y=1$ and $x \in (0,1)$, and denote T_y by T. In this lemma, we discuss the behavior of $\mathrm{hSLE}_\kappa(\nu)$ as $t \to T$ and we will argue that the process does not accumulate at the point 1. To this end, we perform a standard change of coordinate and parameterize the process according the capacity seen from the point 1, see [SW05, Theorem 3].

Set $f(z) = z/(1-z)$. Clearly, f is the conformal Möbius transform of $\mathbb{H}$ sending the points $(0,1,\infty)$ to $(0,\infty,-1)$. Consider the image of $(K_t, 0 \leq t \leq T)$ under f: $(\tilde{K}_s, 0 \leq s \leq \tilde{S})$ where we parameterize this curve by its capacity $s(t)$ seen from ∞. Let $(\tilde{g}_s)$ be the corresponding family of conformal maps and $(\tilde{W}_s)$ be the driving function. Let f_t be the Möbius transform of $\mathbb{H}$ such that $\tilde{g}_s \circ f = f_t \circ g_t$ where $s = s(t)$. By expanding $\tilde{g}_s = f_t \circ g_t \circ f^{-1}$ around ∞ and comparing the coefficients in both sides, we have

$$f_t(z) = -1 - \frac{g_t''(1)}{2g_t'(1)} + \frac{g_t'(1)}{g_t(1)-z}.$$

Thus, with $s = s(t)$,

$$\tilde{W}_s = f_t(W_t) = -1 - \frac{g_t''(1)}{2g_t'(1)} + \frac{g_t'(1)}{g_t(1)-W_t}, \quad d\tilde{W}_s = \frac{(\kappa-6)g_t'(1)dt}{(g_t(1)-W_t)^3} + \frac{g_t'(1)dW_t}{(g_t(1)-W_t)^2}.$$

Define

$$\tilde{V}_s^x = f_t(V_t^x), \quad \tilde{V}_s^\infty = f_t(\infty), \quad \tilde{Z}_s = \frac{\tilde{V}_s^x - \tilde{W}_s}{\tilde{V}_s^x - \tilde{V}_s^\infty} = Z_t.$$

Plugging in the time change

$$\dot{s}(t) = f_t'(W_t)^2 = \frac{g_t'(1)^2}{(g_t(1)-W_t)^4},$$

we obtain

$$d\tilde{W}_s = \sqrt{\kappa} d\tilde{B}_s + \frac{(\nu+2)ds}{\tilde{W}_s - \tilde{V}_s^x} + \frac{(\kappa-6)ds}{\tilde{W}_s - \tilde{V}_s^\infty} - \kappa \frac{F'(\tilde{Z}_s)}{F(\tilde{Z}_s)} \frac{ds}{\tilde{V}_s^x - \tilde{V}_s^\infty},$$

where $\tilde{B}_s$ is one-dimensional Brownian motion. By Girsanov's Theorem, the Radon-Nikodym derivative of the law of $\tilde{K}$ with respect to the law of $\mathrm{SLE}_\kappa(\kappa-6;\nu+2)$ with force points $(-1;\tilde{x} := x/(1-x))$ is given by

$$R_s = \frac{F(Z_s)}{F(x)} \left(\frac{g_s(\tilde{x}) - g_s(-1)}{(1-x)^{-1}} \right)^{-(\nu+2)/\kappa}, \quad \text{where} \quad Z_s = \frac{g_s(\tilde{x}) - W_s}{g_s(\tilde{x}) - g_s(-1)}.$$

Note that $0 \leq Z_s \leq 1$ and $F(z)$ is bounded for $z \in [0,1]$; and that the process $g_s(\tilde{x}) - g_s(-1)$ is increasing, thus $g_s(\tilde{x}) - g_s(-1) \geq 1/(1-x)$. Let S be the swallowing time of -1. Define, for $n \geq 1$,

$$S_n = \inf\{t : K_t \text{ exits } B(0,n)\}.$$

Then R_s is bounded up to $S \wedge S_n$, and thus the process $\tilde{K}$ is absolutely continuous with respect to $\mathrm{SLE}_\kappa(\kappa-6;\nu+2)$ up to $S \wedge S_n$. We list some properties of $\mathrm{SLE}_\kappa(\kappa-6;\nu+2)$ with force points $(-1;\tilde{x}=x/(1-x))$ here: it is generated by continuous curve up to and including the continuation threshold; the curve does not hit the interval $[\tilde{x},\infty)$ when $\nu+2 \geq \kappa/2-2$. When $\kappa \in (0,4]$, the curve almost surely accumulates at the point -1, since $\kappa-6 \leq \kappa/2-4$; when $\kappa \in (4,8)$, the curve hits the interval $(-\infty,-1)$ at finite time almost surely, since $\kappa-6 \in (-2,\kappa/2-2)$. Therefore, the process $\tilde{K}$ is generated by continuous curve up to and including $\tilde{S}$. This implies that our original $\mathrm{hSLE}_\kappa(\nu)$ process $(K_t, t \geq 0)$ is generated by continuous curve up to and including T; moreover, the curve accumulates at a point in $(y,\infty)\cup\{\infty\}$ as $t \to T$, and it does not hit $[x,y]$ when $\nu \geq \kappa/2-4$. □

Proof of Proposition 3.3. In Lemma 3.4, we have shown that $\mathrm{hSLE}_\kappa(\nu)$ is well-defined and is generated by continuous curve up to and including T_y. In particular, when $\kappa \leq 4$, since $T_y = \infty$, we obtain the conclusion for this case. It remains to prove the conclusion for $\kappa \in (4,8)$. In this case, as $t \to T_y$, we have $V_t^y - W_t \to 0$ and $Z_t \to 1$. Note that $F(z)$ remains bounded as $z \to 1$; and that $F'(z)(1-z) \to 0$ as $z \to 1$, since (see [AS92, Eq. (15.2.1) and (15.3.3)]), as $z \to 1$,

$$F'(z) = \left(\frac{\nu+2}{\nu+4}\right)\left(1-\frac{4}{\kappa}\right)(1-z)^{8/\kappa-2}\,{}_2\mathrm{F}_1\left(\frac{4}{\kappa}, \frac{12+2\nu}{\kappa}-1, \frac{8+2\nu}{\kappa}+1; z\right) \approx (1-z)^{8/\kappa-2}.$$

Combining these, we know that the SDE (3.8) degenerates to $W_t = \sqrt{\kappa}B_t$ for $t \geq T_y$. Therefore, the process is the same as standard SLE_κ for $t \geq T_y$, and hence is generated by continuous transient curve. □

3.3 Reversibility of hSLE

In this section, we still work with hSLE in $\mathbb{H}$ from 0 to ∞. In this case, the local martingale in (3.7) has a more explicit expression.

Lemma 3.5. *Fix $\kappa \in (0,8), \nu \in \mathbb{R}$, suppose η is an SLE_κ in $\mathbb{H}$ from 0 to ∞ and $(g_t, t \geq 0)$ is the corresponding family of conformal maps. Fix $0 < x < y$ and let T_x be the swallowing time of x. Define, for $t < T_x$,*

$$J_t = \frac{g_t'(x)g_t'(y)}{(g_t(y)-g_t(x))^2}, \quad Z_t = \frac{g_t(x)-W_t}{g_t(y)-W_t}.$$

Then the following process is a local martingale:

$$M_t := Z_t^a J_t^b F(Z_t)\mathbb{1}_{\{t<T_x\}},$$

where a, b are defined through (3.4) and F is defined through (3.2) or (3.3).

Proposition 3.6. *Fix $\kappa \in (0,8), \nu \geq \kappa/2-4$ and $0 < x < y$. The local martingale defined in Lemma 3.5 is a uniformly integrable martingale for SLE_κ; and the law of SLE_κ weighted by this martingale is the same as $\mathrm{hSLE}_\kappa(\nu)$ with marked points (x,y).*

Proof. In Lemma 3.5, we see that M_t is a local martingale up to the swallowing time of x. Note that J_t is decreasing in t, thus $J_t \leq J_0$. Therefore M_t is bounded as long as J_t and Z_t are bounded from below. Define, for $n \geq 1$,

$$S_n = \inf\{t : J_t \leq 1/n \text{ or } Z_t \leq 1/n\}.$$

Then $M_{t\wedge S_n}$ is a bounded martingale; moreover, the law of SLE_κ weighted by $M_{t\wedge S_n}$ is the law of $\mathrm{hSLE}_\kappa(\nu)$ up to S_n. By Proposition 3.3, we know that $\mathrm{hSLE}_\kappa(\nu)$ is generated by a continuous transient curve and the curve never hits the interval $[x,y]$. Therefore, M_t is actually a uniformly integrable martingale for SLE_κ. This completes the proof of Proposition 3.6. □

Proof of Theorem 1.1. We have shown that $\mathrm{hSLE}_\kappa(\nu)$ is generated by continuous curve in Proposition 3.3, to show Theorem 1.1, it remains to show the reversibility. To this end, we will derive the explicit formula for the limit of M_t—the martingale in Proposition 3.6.

Given a deterministic continuous curve η in $\overline{\mathbb{H}}$ from 0 to ∞ with continuous driving function that does not hit the interval $[x, y]$, denote by $D(x, y)$ the connected component of $\mathbb{H}\setminus\eta$ with $[x, y]$ on the boundary. We know that

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} Z_t = 1, \quad \lim_{t\to\infty} J_t = J_\infty := \frac{g'(x)g'(y)}{(g(y)-g(x))^2},$$

where g is any conformal map from $D(x, y)$ onto $\mathbb{H}$. One can check that the quantity J_∞ only depends on the region $D(x, y)$ and does not depend on the choice of conformal map g. In fact, the quantity J_∞ is the so-called Poisson kernel of the region $D(x, y)$. Thus we have almost surely $M_\infty = \lim_{t\to\infty} M_t = J_\infty^b$. Moreover, the Radon-Nikodym derivative of the law of $\mathrm{hSLE}_\kappa(\nu)$ with marked points (x, y) with respect to the law of SLE_κ is given by M_∞/M_0. Combining the reversibility of standard SLE_κ and the conformal invariance of the quantity M_∞/M_0, we have the reversibility of $\mathrm{hSLE}_\kappa(\nu)$. □

In Proposition 3.6, we proved the reversibility of $\mathrm{hSLE}_\kappa(\nu)$ for $\nu \geq \kappa/2 - 4$. In fact, we believe the reversibility holds for all $\nu > (-4) \vee (\kappa/2 - 6)$.

Conjecture. *Fix $\kappa \in (0, 8)$ and $\nu > (-4) \vee (\kappa/2-6)$ and a quad $(\Omega; x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4)$. Let η be an $\mathrm{hSLE}_\kappa(\nu)$ in Ω from x_1 to x_4 with marked points (x_2, x_3). The time-reversal of η has the same law as $\mathrm{hSLE}_\kappa(\nu)$ in Ω from x_4 to x_1 with marked points (x_3, x_2).*

3.4 Continuity of hSLE: $\nu \leq (-4) \vee (\kappa/2 - 6)$

Proposition 3.7. *Fix $\kappa \in (0, 8)$ and $\nu \leq (-4) \vee (\kappa/2 - 6)$ and $0 < x < y$. The $\mathrm{hSLE}_\kappa(\nu)$ in $\mathbb{H}$ from 0 to ∞ with marked points (x, y) is well-defined up to the swallowing time of x, denoted by T. The process is almost surely continuous up to and including T, and it accumulates at a point in $[x, y)$ as $t \to T$.*

Proof. Suppose $\tilde{\eta}$ is an $\mathrm{SLE}_\kappa(\nu+2, \nu+2)$ in $\mathbb{H}$ from 0 to ∞ with force points (x, y). The law of η is the same as the law of $\tilde{\eta}$ weighted by R_t/R_0 where

$$R_t = (g_t(y) - W_t)^{-(\nu+2)(\nu+6)/(2\kappa)}(1 - Z_t)^{8/\kappa-1-(\nu+2)^2/(2\kappa)}G(1 - Z_t), \quad \text{where} \quad Z_t = \frac{g_t(x) - W_t}{g_t(y) - W_t}.$$

Here G is defined in (3.3). For $n \geq 1$, define S_n to be the min of

$$\inf\{t : \tilde{\eta}(t) \text{ exits } B(0, n)\}, \quad \text{and} \quad \inf\{t : g_t(y) - g_t(x) \geq 1/n\}.$$

Then $R_{T\wedge S_n}$ is bounded. Thus η is continuous up to $T \wedge S_n$.

First, we assume $\kappa \in (4, 8)$ and $\nu \leq \kappa/2 - 6$. Since $\nu + 2 \leq \kappa/2 - 4$ and $2\nu + 4 \leq \kappa/2 - 4$, we know that $\tilde{\eta}$ accumulates at the point x as $t \to T$ (see [Dub09, Lemma 15]), and it is continuous up to and including T. This implies that $R_{T\wedge S_n} \to R_T \in (0, \infty)$ as $n \to \infty$. Therefore, η is continuous up to and including T and it accumulates at the point x as $t \to T$.

Next, we assume $\kappa \in (0, 4]$ and $\nu \leq -4$. Since $\nu + 2 < \kappa/2 - 2$ and $2\nu + 4 \leq \kappa/2 - 4$, we know that $\tilde{\eta}$ accumulates at a point in $[x, y)$ as $t \to T$, and it is continuous up to and including T. Therefore, η is continuous up to and including T and it accumulates at a point in $[x, y)$. This completes the proof. □

Special case: $\kappa = 4$

When $\kappa = 4$ and $\nu \leq -4$, suppose $\eta \sim \mathrm{SLE}_4(\nu + 2, -\nu - 2)$ in $\mathbb{H}$ from x_1 to x_4 with force points (x_2, x_3). In this case, the process η can be viewed as the level line of GFF with the following boundary data $(\lambda = \pi/2)$:

$$-\lambda \text{ on } (-\infty, x_1), \quad \lambda \text{ on } (x_1, x_2), \quad \lambda(\nu + 3) \text{ on } (x_2, x_3), \quad \lambda \text{ on } (x_3, x_4), \quad -\lambda \text{ on } (x_4, \infty).$$

In particular, the process η is continuous up to and including the continuation threshold, denoted by T, see [SS13, WW17]. When $\nu + 3 \leq -1$, the curve η may terminate at either x_2 or x_4. Furthermore, we can calculate the probabilties of these two events.

Lemma 3.8. *Fix $\nu \leq -4$ and set $\alpha = -(\nu+2)/2 \geq 1$. Suppose η is an $\mathrm{SLE}_4(\nu+2, -\nu-2)$ in $\mathbb{H}$ from x_1 to x_4 with force points (x_2, x_3). Let T be its continuation threshold, then we have*

$$\mathbb{P}[\eta(T) = x_2] = 1 - z^\alpha, \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{P}[\eta(T) = x_4] = z^\alpha, \quad \text{where} \quad z = \frac{(x_2 - x_1)(x_4 - x_3)}{(x_3 - x_1)(x_4 - x_2)}.$$

Proof. Recall that the driving function of η satisfies the following:

$$dW_t = 2dB_t + \frac{-(\nu+2)dt}{g_t(x_2) - W_t} + \frac{(\nu+2)dt}{g_t(x_3) - W_t} + \frac{2dt}{g_t(x_4) - W_t}.$$

Define

$$M_t = z_t^\alpha, \quad \text{where} \quad z_t = \frac{(g_t(x_2) - W_t)(g_t(x_4) - g_t(x_3))}{(g_t(x_3) - W_t)(g_t(x_4) - g_t(x_2))}. \tag{3.9}$$

By Itô's Formula, one can check that M_t is a local martingale for η. We see that, as $t \to T$,

$$M_t \to 0, \quad \text{as } \eta(t) \to x_2; \quad \text{and} \quad M_t \to 1, \quad \text{as } \eta(t) \to x_4.$$

Note that $0 \leq M_t \leq 1$. Thus Optional Stopping Theorem implies that

$$\mathbb{P}[\eta(T) = x_4] = \mathbb{E}[M_T] = M_0 = z^\alpha.$$

This gives the conclusion. □

Note that the process $\mathrm{hSLE}_4(\nu)$ for $\nu \leq -4$ defined through (3.3) is nolonger the same as $\eta \sim \mathrm{SLE}_4(\nu+2, -\nu-2)$. In fact, it is the same as η conditioned on $\{\eta(T) = x_2\}$. Or equivalently, $\mathrm{hSLE}_4(\nu)$ is the same as η weighted by the martingale $1 - M_t$ where M_t is defined in (3.9).

3.5 Relation between different hSLE's

By conformal invariance, the $\mathrm{hSLE}_\kappa(\nu)$ can be defined in any quad $(\Omega; x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4)$ via conformal image. Denote by $\mathbb{P}_{\kappa,\nu}(\Omega; x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4)$ the law of $\mathrm{hSLE}_\kappa(\nu)$ in Ω from x_1 to x_4 with marked points (x_2, x_3). Proposition 3.9 derives the relation between hSLE with different ν's. Proposition 3.10 derives the relation between hSLE in different domains. Proposition 3.11 derives the relation between hSLE with different target points.

Proposition 3.9. *Fix $\kappa \in (0,8), \nu \in \mathbb{R}$ and quad $(\Omega; x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4)$. When $\nu \geq \kappa/2 - 4$, we have $\eta \cap (x_2 x_3) = \emptyset$ almost surely. When $(-4) \vee (\kappa/2 - 6) < \nu < \kappa/2 - 4$, the event $\{\eta \cap (x_2 x_3) = \emptyset\}$ has positive chance given by the following*

$$\frac{\mathcal{Z}_{\kappa,\kappa-8-\nu}(\Omega; x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4)\Gamma((2\nu+8)/\kappa)\Gamma((\kappa-4-2\nu)/\kappa)}{\mathcal{Z}_{\kappa,\nu}(\Omega; x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4)\Gamma((2\nu+12-\kappa)/\kappa)\Gamma((2\kappa-8-2\nu)/\kappa)}. \tag{3.10}$$

Moreover, for $(-4) \vee (\kappa/2 - 6) < \nu < \kappa/2 - 4$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}_{\kappa,\nu}(\Omega; x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4)[\cdot \mid \eta \cap (x_2 x_3) = \emptyset] = \mathbb{P}_{\kappa,\kappa-8-\nu}(\Omega; x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4)[\cdot].$$

In particular, when $\kappa \in (4,8)$, the law of SLE_κ from x_1 to x_4 conditioned to avoid $(x_2 x_3)$ is the same as $\mathrm{hSLE}_\kappa(\kappa-6)$ from x_1 to x_4 with marked points (x_2, x_3).

Proof. We may assume $\Omega = \mathbb{H}$ and $x_1 = 0 < x_2 = x < x_3 = y < x_4 = \infty$. Let η be an $\mathrm{hSLE}_\kappa(\nu)$ from 0 to ∞ with marked points (x, y). The fact that $\eta \cap (x, y) = \emptyset$ when $\nu \geq \kappa/2 - 4$ is proved in Proposition 3.3. In the following, we assume $(-4) \vee (\kappa/2 - 6) < \nu < \kappa/2 - 4$.

Set $\hat{\nu} = \kappa - 8 - \nu$ and $\hat{a} = (\hat{\nu} + 2)/\kappa$, and let $\hat{\eta}$ be an $\mathrm{hSLE}_\kappa(\hat{\nu})$ from 0 to ∞ with marked points (x, y). The following process is a local martingale for η:

$$M_t = z_t^{\hat{a}-a} \hat{F}(z_t)/F(z_t), \quad \text{where} \quad z_t = \frac{g_t(x) - W_t}{g_t(y) - W_t},$$

and F is defined through (3.2) and

$$\hat{F}(z) = {}_2\mathrm{F}_1\left(\frac{2(\kappa - 6 - \nu)}{\kappa}, 1 - \frac{4}{\kappa}, \frac{2(\kappa - 4 - \nu)}{\kappa}; z\right).$$

Moreover, the law of η weighted by M is the same as $\hat{\eta}$ up to the first time that x is swallowed. Since $\hat{\nu} \geq \kappa/2 - 4$, we know that $\hat{\eta}$ does not hit the interval (x, y). Thus the swallowing time of x coincides with the swallowing time of y, denoted by T_y. Therefore, M is a uniform integrable martingale for η. As $t \to T_y$, we have $z_t \to 1$. Thus the law of $\hat{\eta}$ is the same as η weighted by $\mathbb{1}_{\{\eta \cap (x,y) = \emptyset\}}$. In particular, we have

$$\mathbb{P}[\eta \cap (x, y) = \emptyset] = z^{\hat{a}-a} \frac{\hat{F}(z)/\hat{F}(1)}{F(z)/F(1)}, \quad \text{where} \quad z = x/y.$$

This gives (3.10). □

Next, we derive the boundary perturbation property of the $\mathrm{hSLE}_\kappa(\nu)$, this is a generalization of the boundary perturbation property of SLE_κ derived in [LSW03, Section 5]. Suppose $\hat{\Omega} \subset \Omega$ such that $\hat{\Omega}$ is simply connected and agrees with Ω in a neighborhood of $(x_1 x_4)$. In the following proposition, we will derive the relation between $\mathbb{P}_{\kappa,\nu}(\hat{\Omega}; x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4)$ and $\mathbb{P}_{\kappa,\nu}(\Omega; x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4)$. To this end, we need to introduce Brownian loop measure.

The *Brownian loop measure* is a conformally invariant measure on unrooted Brownian loops in the plane. In the present article, we will not need the precise definition of this measure, so we content ourselves with referring to the literature for the definition: see, e.g., [Law09] or [LW04, Sections 3 and 4]. Given a non-empty simply connected domain $\Omega \subsetneq \mathbb{C}$ and two disjoint subsets $V_1, V_2 \subset \Omega$, we denote by $\mu(\Omega; V_1, V_2)$ the Brownian loop measure of loops in Ω that intersect both V_1 and V_2. This quantity is conformally invariant: $\mu(f(\Omega); f(V_1), f(V_2)) = \mu(\Omega; V_1, V_2)$ for any conformal transformation $f \colon \Omega \to f(\Omega)$. In general, the Brownian loop measure is an infinite measure. By [Law09, Corollary 4.6], we have $0 \leq \mu(\Omega; V_1, V_2) < \infty$ when both of V_1, V_2 are closed, one of them is compact, $\mathrm{dist}(V_1, V_2) > 0$, and the boundary of the domain Ω is non-polar for the Brownian motion, i.e., there is a positive chance that the Brownian motion started from any point $z \in \mathbb{C}$ hits the set $\partial\Omega$.

Proposition 3.10. *Fix $\kappa \in (0, 4]$ and $\nu > -4$. Let $(\Omega; x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4)$ be a quad such that Ω has non-polar boundary and x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4 are on analytic boundary segments. Assume that $\hat{\Omega} \subset \Omega$ is simply connected and it agrees with Ω in a neighborhood of the arc $(x_1 x_4)$. Then the $\mathrm{hSLE}_\kappa(\nu)$ in $\hat{\Omega}$ is absolutely continuous with respect to $\mathrm{hSLE}_\kappa(\nu)$ in Ω, and the Radon-Nikodym derivative is given by*

$$\frac{d\mathbb{P}_{\kappa,\nu}(\hat{\Omega}; x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4)}{d\mathbb{P}_{\kappa,\nu}(\Omega; x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4)} = \frac{\mathcal{Z}_{\kappa,\nu}(\Omega; x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4)}{\mathcal{Z}_{\kappa,\nu}(\hat{\Omega}; x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4)} \mathbb{1}_{\{\eta \subset \hat{\Omega}\}} \exp(c\mu(\Omega; \eta, \Omega \setminus \hat{\Omega})),$$

where $c = (3\kappa - 8)(6 - \kappa)/(2\kappa)$ and $\mathcal{Z}_{\kappa,\nu}$ is defined through (3.5) and (3.6).

Proof. We may assume $\Omega = \mathbb{H}$ and $x_1 = 0 < x_2 = x < x_3 = y < x_4 = \infty$. Let ϕ be the conformal map from $\hat{\Omega}$ onto $\mathbb{H}$ such that $\phi(0) = 0$ and $\lim_{z\to\infty} \phi(z)/z = 1$. Suppose η (resp. $\hat{\eta}$) is $\mathrm{hSLE}_\kappa(\nu)$ in $\mathbb{H}$ (resp. in $\hat{\Omega}$) from 0 to ∞ with marked points (x, y). Let $(g_t, t \geq 0)$ be the corresponding family of conformal

maps, and V_t^x, V_t^y are the evolution of x, y respectively. Let T be the first time when η exits $\hat{\Omega}$. We will study the law of $\tilde{\eta}(t) = \phi(\eta(t))$ for $t < T$. Define $\tilde{g}_t$ to be the conformal map from $\mathbb{H} \setminus \tilde{\eta}[0,t]$ onto $\mathbb{H}$ normalized at ∞ and let φ_t be the conformal map from $\mathbb{H} \setminus g_t(K)$ onto $\mathbb{H}$ such that $\varphi_t \circ g_t = \tilde{g}_t \circ \phi$. One can check that the following process is a local martingale for η:

$$M_t := \mathbb{1}_{\{t<T\}} \varphi_t'(W_t)^h \varphi_t'(V_t^x)^b \varphi_t'(V_t^y)^b \left(\frac{\varphi_t(V_t^y) - \varphi_t(V_t^x)}{V_t^y - V_t^x} \right)^{-2b} \exp(c\mu(\mathbb{H}; \eta[0,t], \mathbb{H} \setminus \hat{\Omega}))$$
$$\times \left(\frac{\varphi_t(V_t^x) - \varphi_t(W_t)}{\varphi_t(V_t^y) - \varphi_t(W_t)} \Big/ \frac{V_t^x - W_t}{V_t^y - W_t} \right)^a \times F\left(\frac{\varphi_t(V_t^x) - \varphi_t(W_t)}{\varphi_t(V_t^y) - \varphi_t(W_t)} \right) \Big/ F\left(\frac{V_t^x - W_t}{V_t^y - W_t} \right),$$

where a, b, h are defined through (3.4) and F is defined through (3.2). Moreover, the law of η weighted by M is the same as $\hat{\eta}$ up to $t < T$. Since $\kappa \leq 4$, the process $\mathrm{hSLE}_\kappa(\nu)$ in $\hat{\Omega}$ never exits $\hat{\Omega}$ and goes to ∞. Therefore, M is a uniformly integrable martingale for η and the law of η weighted by M_T/M_0 is the same as $\hat{\eta}$ where

$$M_T := \lim_{t \to T} M_t = \mathbb{1}_{\{\eta \subset \hat{\Omega}\}} \exp(c\mu(\mathbb{H}; \eta, \mathbb{H} \setminus \hat{\Omega})).$$

This completes the proof. □

Proposition 3.11. *Fix $\kappa \in (0,8)$ and quad $(\Omega; x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4)$. Let η be an $\mathrm{hSLE}_\kappa(\kappa - 8)$ in Ω from x_1 to x_4 with marked points (x_2, x_3) conditioned to hit $[x_2, x_3]$. Let $\tilde{\eta}$ be an hSLE_κ in Ω from x_1 to x_2 with marked points (x_4, x_3). Then $\tilde{\eta}$ has the same law as η up to the swallowing time of x_2.*

Proof. We may assume $\Omega = \mathbb{H}$ and $x_1 < x_2 < x_3 < x_4$. Let T (resp. $\tilde{T}$) be the swallowing time of x_2 for η (resp. for $\tilde{\eta}$). Denote $X_{j1} = g_t(x_j) - W_t$ for $2 \leq j \leq 4$ and $X_{ij} = g_t(x_j) - g_t(x_i)$ for $2 \leq i < j \leq 4$. When $\nu = \kappa - 8$, we have

$$a = \frac{\nu + 2}{\kappa} = -2h, \quad b = \frac{(\nu+2)(\nu+6-\kappa)}{4\kappa} = h.$$

First, we assume $\kappa \in (4,8)$. In this case, we have $\kappa - 8 > \kappa/2 - 6$. Define

$$F(z) := {}_2\mathrm{F}_1\left(2 - \frac{12}{\kappa}, 1 - \frac{4}{\kappa}, 2 - \frac{8}{\kappa}; z\right), \quad \tilde{F}(z) := {}_2\mathrm{F}_1\left(\frac{4}{\kappa}, 1 - \frac{4}{\kappa}, \frac{8}{\kappa}; z\right).$$

When $\kappa \in (4,8)$, both F and $\tilde{F}$ are bounded for $z \in [0,1]$. The law of η is the same as SLE_κ in $\mathbb{H}$ from x_1 to ∞ weighted by the following local martingale up to T:

$$M_t = g_t'(x_2)^h g_t'(x_3)^h g_t'(x_4)^h X_{41}^{-2h} X_{32}^{-2h} z_t^{-2h} F(z_t), \quad \text{where} \quad z_t = \frac{X_{21} X_{43}}{X_{31} X_{42}}.$$

The law of $\tilde{\eta}$ is the same as SLE_κ in $\mathbb{H}$ from x_1 to ∞ weighted by the following local martingale up to $\tilde{T}$:

$$\tilde{M}_t = g_t'(x_2)^h g_t'(x_3)^h g_t'(x_4)^h X_{21}^{-2h} X_{43}^{-2h} s_t^{2/\kappa} \tilde{F}(s_t), \quad \text{where} \quad s_t = \frac{X_{32} X_{41}}{X_{31} X_{42}}.$$

Comparing these two local martingales, we see that the law of $\tilde{\eta}$ is the same as η weighted by the following local martingale up to T:

$$N_t = (1 - z_t)^{8/\kappa - 1} \tilde{F}(1 - z_t)/F(z_t).$$

As $t \to T < \infty$, we have $z_t \to 0$. Thus $N_T = \mathbb{1}_{\{T<\infty\}} \tilde{F}(1)/F(0)$. Therefore, the law of $\tilde{\eta}$ is the same as η up to the swallowing time of x_2.

Next, we assume $\kappa \in (0,4]$. In this case, we have $\kappa - 8 \leq -4$. Define

$$G(z) := {}_2\mathrm{F}_1\left(1 - \frac{4}{\kappa}, \frac{4}{\kappa}, \frac{8}{\kappa}; z\right).$$

The law of η is the same as SLE_κ in $\mathbb{H}$ from x_1 to ∞ weighted by the following local martingale up to T:

$$M_t = g_t'(x_2)^h g_t'(x_3)^h g_t'(x_4)^h X_{41}^{-2h} X_{32}^{-2h} z_t^{-2h} (1-z_t)^{8/\kappa-1} G(1-z_t).$$

Therefore, the law of $\tilde{\eta}$ is the same as η weighted by the following local martingale up to T:

$$N_t = \tilde{F}(1-z_t)/G(1-z_t).$$

As $t \to T < \infty$, we have $z_t \to 0$. Thus $N_T = \mathbb{1}_{\{T<\infty\}} \tilde{F}(1)/G(1)$. This gives the conclusion for $\kappa \leq 4$ and completes the proof. □

4 Hypergeometric SLE: Relation to SLE pairs

4.1 Definitions and Statements

For convenience, we introduce some notations. Fix a quad $q = (\Omega; x^R, y^R, y^L, x^L)$, consider disjoint continuous simple curves $(\eta^L; \eta^R) \in X_0(\Omega; x^R, y^R, y^L, x^L)$. Let T^R be the first time that η^R hits the closed arc $[y^R y^L]$, and denote by w^R the point $\eta^R(T^R)$, and by Ω^R the connected component of $\Omega \setminus \eta^R[0, T^R]$ with $(y^L x^L)$ on the boundary. Note that T^R, w^R, Ω^R are measurable with respect to η^R. Let T^L be the first time that η^R hits the closed arc $[y^R y^L]$, and denote by w^L the point $\eta^L(T^L)$, and by Ω^L the connected component of $\Omega \setminus \eta^L[0, T^L]$ with $(x^R y^R)$ on the boundary. See Figure 4.1.



Figure 4.1: Let T^R be the first time that η^R hits the closed arc $[y^R y^L]$, and denote by w^R the point $\eta^R(T^R)$, and by Ω^R the connected component of $\Omega \setminus \eta^R[0, T^R]$ with $(y^L x^L)$ on the boundary. Note that T^R, w^R, Ω^R are measurable with respect to η^R. We define T^L, w^L, Ω^L for η^L similarly.

Proposition 4.1. *Assume the same notations as in Figure 4.1. Fix $\kappa \in (0, 4]$ and $\rho^L > -2, \rho^R > -2$ and quad $q = (\Omega; x^R, y^R, y^L, x^L)$.*

- *(Existence and Uniqueness) There exists a unique probability measure on disjoint continuous simple curves $(\eta^L; \eta^R) \in X_0(\Omega; x^R, y^R, y^L, x^L)$ such that the conditional law of η^R given η^L is $\mathrm{SLE}_\kappa(\rho^R)$ in Ω^L from x^R to y^R with force point x_+^R; and that the conditional law of η^L given η^R is $\mathrm{SLE}_\kappa(\rho^L)$ in Ω^R from x^L to y^L with force point x_-^L.*
- *(Identification) Under this probability measure and fix $\rho^L = 0$ and $\rho^R > -2$, the marginal law of η^L is $\mathrm{hSLE}_\kappa(\rho^R)$ in Ω from x^L to y^L with marked points (x^R, y^R).*

Proposition 4.2. *Assume the same notations as in Figure 4.1. Fix $\kappa \in (0, 4]$ and $\rho > -2$ and quad $q = (\Omega; x^R, y^R, y^L, x^L)$.*

- *(Existence and Uniqueness) There exists a unique probability measure on disjoint continuous simple curves $(\eta^L; \eta^R) \in X_0(\Omega; x^R, y^R, y^L, x^L)$ such that the conditional law of η^R given η^L is $\mathrm{SLE}_\kappa(\rho)$ in Ω^L from x^R to y^R with force point w^L; and that the conditional law of η^L given η^R is $\mathrm{SLE}_\kappa(\rho)$ in Ω^R from x^L to y^L with force point w^R. We denote this probability measure by $\mathbb{Q}_q(\kappa, \rho)$.*

- *(Identification) Under this probability measure, the marginal of η^R stopped at the first hitting time of $[y^R y^L]$ is the same as* $\mathrm{hSLE}_\kappa(\kappa-8-\rho)$ *in Ω from x^R to x^L with marked points (y^R, y^L) conditioned to hit $[y^R y^L]$, stopped at the swallowing time of y^R.*

The main result of this section is proving these two propositions. The uniqueness part in Propositions 4.1 and 4.2 were proved in [MS16b, Theorem 4.1]. The key point in the existence part of Proposition 4.1 is Proposition 3.10. The key point in the existence part of Proposition 4.2 is "Commutation Relation" derived by J. Dubédat. Proposition 4.2 is the main ingredient in the proof of Theorem 1.4.

4.2 Proof of Proposition 4.1

The uniqueness in Proposition 4.1 was proved in [MS16b, Theorem 4.1]. We only need to show the existence and the identification. To construct the pair $(\eta^L;\eta^R)$ in Proposition 4.1, we need to introduce boundary perturbation property of $\mathrm{SLE}_\kappa(\rho)$ process. This is a particular case of Proposition 3.10.

Lemma 4.3. *[WW13, Section 3]. Fix $\kappa\in(0,4], \rho>-2$. Let $(\Omega;x,y)$ be a Dobursin domain such that Ω has non-polar boundary and x,y are on analytic boundary segments. Assume that $\hat\Omega\subset\Omega$ is simply connected and it agrees with Ω in a neighborhood of the arc (xy). Then* $\mathrm{SLE}_\kappa(\rho)$ *in $\hat\Omega$ from x to y with force point x_+ is absolutely continuous with respect to* $\mathrm{SLE}_\kappa(\rho)$ *in Ω from x to y with force point x_+, and the Radon-Nikodym derivative is given by*

$$\mathbb{1}_{\{\eta\subset\hat\Omega\}}(\varphi'(x)\varphi'(y))^{-b}\exp(c\mu(\Omega;\eta,\Omega\setminus\hat\Omega)),\quad \text{where } b=\frac{(\rho+2)(\rho+6-\kappa)}{4\kappa},\quad c=\frac{(3\kappa-8)(6-\kappa)}{2\kappa},$$

and μ is Brownian loop measure, and φ is any conformal map from $\hat\Omega$ onto Ω fixing x and y.

Proof of Proposition 4.1, Existence and Identification. First, we will construct a probability measure on $(\eta^L;\eta^R)\in X_0(\Omega;x^L,x^R,y^R,y^L)$. Fix $\kappa\in(0,4], \rho^L>-2, \rho^R>-2$ and $0<x<y$. By conformal invariance, it is sufficient to give the construction for the quad $(\mathbb{H};0,x,y,\infty)$. Denote by $\mathbb{P}_L$ the law of $\mathrm{SLE}_\kappa(\rho^L)$ in $\mathbb{H}$ from 0 to ∞ with force point 0_- and denote by $\mathbb{P}_R$ the law of $\mathrm{SLE}_\kappa(\rho^R)$ in $\mathbb{H}$ from x to y with force point x_+. Define measure $\mathcal{M}$ on $X_0(\mathbb{H};0,x,y,\infty)$ by

$$\mathcal{M}[d\eta^L,d\eta^R]=\mathbb{1}_{\{\eta^L\cap\eta^R=\emptyset\}}\exp\left(c\mu(\mathbb{H};\eta^L,\eta^R)\right)\mathbb{P}_L\left[d\eta^L\right]\otimes\mathbb{P}_R\left[d\eta^R\right].$$

We argue that the total mass of $\mathcal{M}$, denoted by $|\mathcal{M}|$, is finite. Given $\eta^L\in X_0(\mathbb{H};0,\infty)$, let g be any conformal map from the connected component of $\mathbb{H}\setminus\eta^L$ with (xy) on the boundary onto $\mathbb{H}$, then we have

$$\begin{aligned}|\mathcal{M}|&=\mathbb{E}_L\otimes\mathbb{E}_R\left[\mathbb{1}_{\{\eta^L\cap\eta^R=\emptyset\}}\exp\left(c\mu(\mathbb{H};\eta^L,\eta^R)\right)\right]\\&=\mathbb{E}_L\left[\left(\frac{g'(x)g'(y)}{(g(x)-g(y))^2}\right)^b\right]&\text{(By Lemma 4.3)}\\&\le(y-x)^{-2b}.&\text{(where } b=(\rho^R+2)(\rho^R+6-\kappa)/(4\kappa))\end{aligned}$$

This implies that $|\mathcal{M}|$ is positive finite. We define the probability measure $\mathcal{M}^\sharp$ to be $\mathcal{M}/|\mathcal{M}|$.

Second, we show that, under $\mathcal{M}^\sharp$, the conditional law of η^R given η^L is $\mathrm{SLE}_\kappa(\rho^R)$. By the symmetry in the definition of $\mathcal{M}$, we know that the conditional law of η^L given η^R is $\mathrm{SLE}_\kappa(\rho^L)$. Given η^L, denote by H the connected component of $\mathbb{H}\setminus\eta^L$ with (xy) on the boundary and let g be any conformal map from H onto $\mathbb{H}$. Denote by $\mathbb{P}_R$ the law of $\mathrm{SLE}_\kappa(\rho^R)$ in $\mathbb{H}$ from x to y and by $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}_R$ the law of $\mathrm{SLE}_\kappa(\rho^R)$ in H from x to y. By Lemma 4.3, for any bounded continuous function $\mathcal{F}$ on continuous curves, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{M}^\sharp\left[\mathcal{F}(\eta^R)\,|\,\eta^L\right]&=|\mathcal{M}|^{-1}\mathbb{E}_R\left[\mathbb{1}_{\{\eta^L\cap\eta^R=\emptyset\}}\exp\left(c\mu(\mathbb{H};\eta^L,\eta^R)\right)\mathcal{F}(\eta^R)\right]\\&=|\mathcal{M}|^{-1}\left(\frac{g'(x)g'(y)}{(g(x)-g(y))^2}\right)^b\tilde{\mathbb{E}}_R\left[\mathcal{F}(\eta^R)\right].\end{aligned}$$

This implies that the conditional law of η^R given η^L is $\mathrm{SLE}_\kappa(\rho^R)$ in H.

Finally, we show that, under $\mathcal{M}^\sharp$ and fixing $\rho^L = 0$, the marginal law of η^L is $\mathrm{hSLE}_\kappa(\rho^R)$. In fact, the above equation implies that the law of η^L is the law of SLE_κ in $\mathbb{H}$ from 0 to ∞ weighted by

$$\left(\frac{g'(x)g'(y)}{(g(x)-g(y))^2}\right)^b.$$

Therefore, by Proposition 3.6 and the argument in its proof, we see that the law of η^L coincides with $\mathrm{hSLE}_\kappa(\rho^R)$ as desired. □

4.3 Commutation Relation

In [Dub07] and [KP16, Appendix A], the authors studied local multiple SLEs and classify them according to the so-called partition functions. Following the same idea, we will define a local SLE that describes two initial segments with two extra marked points. Fix a quad $q = (\Omega; x^R, y^R, y^L, x^L)$. We will study a local SLE in Ω that describes two initial segments γ_1 and γ_4 starting from x_1 and x_4 respectively, with two extra marked points x_2 and x_3, up to exiting some neighborhoods U_1 and U_4. The localization neighborhoods U_1 and U_4 are assumed to be closed subsets of $\overline{\Omega}$ such that $\Omega \setminus U_j$ are simply connected for $j = 1, 4$ and that $U_1 \cap U_4 = \emptyset$ and that $\mathrm{dist}(\{x_2, x_3\}, U_1 \cup U_4) > 0$. Define

$$\mathfrak{X}_4 = \{(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4) \in \mathbb{R}^4 : x_1 < x_2 < x_3 < x_4\}.$$

The local SLE_κ in Ω, started from (x_1, x_4) and localized in (U_1, U_4) with two marked points (x_2, x_3), is a probability measure on two curves (γ_1, γ_4) such that, for $j \in \{1, 4\}$, the curve $\gamma_j : [0, 1] \to U_j$ starts at $\gamma_j(0) = x_j$ and ends at $\gamma_j(1) \in \partial U_j$. The local SLE_κ is the indexed collection

$$P = \left(P_{(q;U_1,U_4)}\right)_{q;U_1,U_4}.$$

This collection of probability measures is required to satisfy the following three properties.

- Conformal Invariance. Suppose that $q = (\Omega; x^R, y^R, y^L, x^L), \tilde{q} = (\tilde{\Omega}; \tilde{x}^R, \tilde{y}^R, \tilde{y}^L, \tilde{x}^L) \in \mathcal{Q}$, and $\psi : \Omega \to \tilde{\Omega}$ is a conformal map with $\psi(x^R) = \tilde{x}^R, \psi(y^R) = \tilde{y}^R, \psi(y^L) = \tilde{y}^L, \psi(x^L) = \tilde{x}^L$. Then for $(\gamma_1, \gamma_4) \sim P_{(q;U_1,U_4)}$, we have $(\psi(\gamma_1), \psi(\gamma_4)) \sim P_{(\tilde{q};\psi(U_1),\psi(U_4))}$.
- Domain Markov Property. Suppose that τ_1 is a stopping time for γ_1 and τ_4 is a stopping time for γ_4. The conditional law of $(\gamma_1|_{t\geq\tau_1}, \gamma_4|_{t\geq\tau_4})$, given the initial segments $\gamma_1[0, \tau_1]$ and $\gamma_4[0, \tau_4]$, is the same as $P_{(\tilde{q};\tilde{U}_1,\tilde{U}_4)}$ where $\tilde{q} = (\tilde{\Omega}; \gamma_1(\tau_1), x_2, x_3, \gamma_4(\tau_4))$ and $\tilde{\Omega}$ is the connected component of $\Omega \setminus (\gamma_1[0, \tau_1] \cup \gamma_4[0, \tau_4])$ with (x_2x_3) on the boundary, and $\tilde{U}_j = U_j \cap \tilde{\Omega}$ for $j \in \{1, 4\}$.
- Absolute Continuity of the Marginals. There exist smooth functions $F_j : \mathfrak{X}_4 \to \mathbb{R}$, for $j \in \{1, 4\}$, such that for the domain $\Omega = \mathbb{H}$, boundary points $x_1 < x_2 < x_3 < x_4$, and localization neighborhoods U_1 and U_4, the marginal law of γ_j under $P_{(\mathbb{H};x_1,x_2,x_3,x_4;U_1,U_4)}$ is the Loewner chain driven by the solution to the following SDEs:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\text{for } \gamma_1: \quad dW_t = \sqrt{\kappa}dB_t + F_1(W_t, V_t^2, V_t^3, V_t^4)dt, \quad dV_t^i = \frac{2dt}{V_t^i - W_t}, \quad \text{for } i = 2, 3, 4;\\
&\text{for } \gamma_4: \quad d\tilde{W}_t = \sqrt{\kappa}d\tilde{B}_t + F_4(\tilde{V}_t^1, \tilde{V}_t^2, \tilde{V}_t^3, \tilde{W}_t)dt, \quad d\tilde{V}_t^i = \frac{2dt}{\tilde{V}_t^i - W_t}, \quad \text{for } i = 1, 2, 3;
\end{aligned} \tag{4.1}$$

  where $W_0 = x_1, V_0^2 = x_2, V_0^3 = x_3$ and $V_0^4 = x_4$ and $\tilde{W}_0 = x_4, \tilde{V}_0^1 = x_1, \tilde{V}_0^2 = x_2, \tilde{V}_0^3 = x_3$.

Lemma 4.4. *Suppose both (U_1, U_4) and (V_1, V_4) are localization neighborhoods for quad $q = (\Omega; x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4)$ and that $V_j \subset U_j$ for $j \in \{1, 4\}$. Suppose $(\gamma_1, \gamma_4) \sim P_{(q;U_1,U_4)}$ and let τ_j be γ_j's first time to exit V_j for $j \in \{1, 4\}$. Then $(\gamma_1|_{[0,\tau_1]}, \gamma_4|_{[0,\tau_4]}) \sim P_{(q;V_1,V_4)}$.*

Proof. It is clear that the restriction measures also satisfy all the required three properties. □

It turns out that the existence of local SLE with two extra points is related to positive functions which satisfy a certain PDE system and conformal covariance: $h = (6-\kappa)/(2\kappa)$ and b is a constant parameter,

- PDE system (PDE):

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{\kappa}{2}\partial_{x_1}^2\mathcal{Z} + \sum_{2\le i\le 4}\frac{2\partial_{x_i}\mathcal{Z}}{x_i - x_1} + \left(\frac{-2h}{(x_4-x_1)^2} + \frac{-2b}{(x_2-x_1)^2} + \frac{-2b}{(x_3-x_1)^2}\right)\mathcal{Z} = 0,\\
&\frac{\kappa}{2}\partial_{x_4}^2\mathcal{Z} + \sum_{1\le i\le 3}\frac{2\partial_{x_i}\mathcal{Z}}{x_i - x_4} + \left(\frac{-2h}{(x_1-x_4)^2} + \frac{-2b}{(x_2-x_4)^2} + \frac{-2b}{(x_3-x_4)^2}\right)\mathcal{Z} = 0,
\end{aligned} \tag{4.2}$$

- Conformal Covariance (COV): for all Möbius maps φ of $\mathbb{H}$ such that $\varphi(x_1) < \varphi(x_2) < \varphi(x_3) < \varphi(x_4)$,

$$\mathcal{Z}(x_1,x_2,x_3,x_4) = \varphi'(x_1)^h\varphi'(x_2)^b\varphi'(x_3)^b\varphi'(x_4)^h \times \mathcal{Z}(\varphi(x_1),\varphi(x_2),\varphi(x_3),\varphi(x_4)). \tag{4.3}$$

Proposition 4.5. *We have the following correspondence between local* SLE *with two extra marked points and positive solutions to PDE* (4.2) *and COV* (4.3)*.*

(a) Suppose $\mathcal{Z} : \mathfrak{X}_4 \to \mathbb{R}$ is a positive solution to PDE (4.2) *and COV* (4.3)*. Then there exists a local* SLE_κ *with two extra marked points such that the drift terms in* (4.1) *are given by $F_1 = \kappa\partial_{x_1}\log\mathcal{Z}$ and $F_4 = \kappa\partial_{x_4}\log\mathcal{Z}$.*

(b) Suppose there exists a local SLE_κ *with two extra marked points. Then there exists a positive solution $\mathcal{Z} : \mathfrak{X}_4 \to \mathbb{R}$ to PDE* (4.2) *and COV* (4.3) *such that the drift terms in* (4.1) *are given by $F_1 = \kappa\partial_{x_1}\log\mathcal{Z}$ and $F_4 = \kappa\partial_{x_4}\log\mathcal{Z}$.*

Proof of Proposition 4.5—Part (a). There are two ways to sample γ_1 and γ_4: Method 1—sample γ_1 first, and Method 2—sample γ_4 first.

Method 1. Since $\mathcal{Z}$ satisfies PDE (4.2), the following process is a local martingale with respect to the law of SLE_κ in $\mathbb{H}$ from x_1 to ∞:

$$M_t^{(1)} = g_t'(x_2)^b g_t'(x_3)^b g_t'(x_4)^h \mathcal{Z}(W_t, g_t(x_2), g_t(x_3), g_t(x_4)).$$

We sample γ_1 according to the law of SLE_κ in $\mathbb{H}$ from x_1 to ∞ weighted by the local martingale $M_t^{(1)}$, up to the first time σ_1 that the process exits U_1. Let $G = g_{\sigma_1}$ and denote by

$$\tilde{x}_1 = G(\gamma_1(\sigma_1)), \quad \tilde{x}_2 = G(x_2), \quad \tilde{x}_3 = G(x_3), \quad \tilde{x}_4 = G(x_4).$$

Since $\mathcal{Z}$ satisfies PDE (4.2), the following process is a local martingale with respect to the law of SLE_κ in $\mathbb{H}$ from x_4 to ∞:

$$\tilde{M}_s^{(4)} = \tilde{g}_s'(\tilde{x}_1)^h \tilde{g}_s'(\tilde{x}_2)^b \tilde{g}_s'(\tilde{x}_3)^b \mathcal{Z}(\tilde{g}_s(\tilde{x}_1), \tilde{g}_s(\tilde{x}_2), \tilde{g}_s(\tilde{x}_3), \tilde{W}_s).$$

We sample $\tilde{\gamma}_4$ according to the the law of SLE_κ in $\mathbb{H}$ from $\tilde{x}_4$ to ∞ weighted by the local martingale $\tilde{M}_s^{(4)}$, up to the first time $\tilde{\sigma}_4$ that the process exits $G(U_4)$. Finally, set $\gamma_4 = G^{-1}(\tilde{\gamma}_4)$.

Method 2. This is defined in the same way as in Method 1 except we switch the roles of γ_1 and γ_4.

According to the local commutation relation in [Dub07, Theorem 7.1], these two methods give the same law on pairs (γ_1, γ_4). The probability measure defined by the sampling procedure clearly satisfies Domain Markov Property and Absolute Continuity of the Marginals. By COV (4.3), we could define the law on (γ_1, γ_4) in any simple connected domain via conformal image. This implies Conformal Invariance. □

Proposition 4.5—Part (b). Since the local SLE with extra two points is conformal invariant, we could assume $x_2 = \infty, x_3 = 0, x_4 = x, x_1 = y$ for $0 < x < y$. By [Dub07, Theorem 7.1], the existence of local SLE_κ in neighborhoods of x and y with two extra marked points 0 and ∞ implies that there exists a positive function $\psi : \mathfrak{X}_2 \to \mathbb{R}$ that solves the following PDE system:

$$\frac{\kappa}{2}\partial_x^2\psi + \frac{2}{x}\partial_x\psi + \left(\frac{2}{x} + \frac{2}{y-x}\right)\partial_y\psi + \left(\frac{-2h}{(y-x)^2} + \frac{-\mu}{x^2}\right)\psi = 0,$$
$$\frac{\kappa}{2}\partial_y^2\psi + \frac{2}{y}\partial_y\psi + \left(\frac{2}{y} + \frac{2}{x-y}\right)\partial_x\psi + \left(\frac{-2h}{(x-y)^2} + \frac{-\mu}{y^2}\right)\psi = 0,$$

where μ is a constant parameter. Moreover, the marginal laws of γ_1, γ_4 is the Loewner chain driven by the solution to the following SDEs:

$$\text{for } \gamma_1 : dW_t = \sqrt{\kappa}dB_t + \kappa(\partial_y \log\psi)(V_t^4 - V_t^3, W_t - V_t^3)dt, \quad dV_t^i = \frac{2dt}{V_t^i - W_t}, \quad i = 3, 4;$$
$$\text{for } \gamma_4 : d\tilde{W}_t = \sqrt{\kappa}dB_t + \kappa(\partial_x \log\psi)(\tilde{W}_t - \tilde{V}_t^3, \tilde{V}_t^1 - \tilde{V}_t^3)dt, \quad d\tilde{V}_t^i = \frac{2dt}{\tilde{V}_t^i - \tilde{W}_t}, \quad i = 1, 3.$$

By the argument in [Gra07, Sections 4 and 5], we see that ψ needs to satisfy the following conformal covariance: for any Möbius maps φ of $\mathbb{H}$ with $\varphi(x) < \varphi(y)$,

$$\psi(x, y) = \varphi'(x)^h\varphi'(y)^h\psi(\varphi(x), \varphi(y)).$$

We write $\phi(x, y) = (y - x)^{2h}\psi(x, y)$. Then ϕ satisfies the following PDE system:

$$\frac{\kappa}{2}\partial_x^2\phi + \left(\frac{2}{x} + \frac{6-\kappa}{y-x}\right)\partial_x\phi + \left(\frac{2}{x} + \frac{2}{y-x}\right)\partial_y\phi + \frac{-\mu}{x^2}\phi = 0,$$
$$\frac{\kappa}{2}\partial_y^2\phi + \left(\frac{2}{y} + \frac{6-\kappa}{x-y}\right)\partial_y\phi + \left(\frac{2}{y} + \frac{2}{x-y}\right)\partial_x\phi + \frac{-\mu}{y^2}\phi = 0.$$

Moreover, ϕ is conformal invariant: for any Möbius maps φ of $\mathbb{H}$ with $\varphi(x) < \varphi(y)$, we have $\phi(x, y) = \phi(\varphi(x), \varphi(y))$. Since ϕ is conformal invariant, it only depends on the ratio $x/y \in (0, 1)$. Thus we may write $\phi(x, y) = f(x/y)$. Then f satisfies the following ODE:

$$\frac{\kappa}{2}z^2 f''(z) + \frac{z(2 + (2-\kappa)z)}{1-z}f'(z) - \mu f(z) = 0. \tag{4.4}$$

Define, for $x_1 < x_2 < x_3 < x_4$,

$$\mathcal{Z}(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4) := (x_4 - x_1)^{-2h}(x_3 - x_2)^{-\mu}f(z), \quad \text{where } z = \frac{(x_2 - x_1)(x_4 - x_3)}{(x_3 - x_1)(x_4 - x_2)}.$$

Since f satisfies ODE (4.4) and is conformal invariant, we could check that $\mathcal{Z}$ satisfies PDE (4.2) and COV (4.3) with $b = \mu/2$. □

Corollary 4.6. *For any $\kappa \in (0, 8)$ and $\nu \in \mathbb{R}$, there exists a local SLE_κ with two extra marked points such that the drift term in (4.1) are give by $F_1 = \kappa\partial_{x_1}\log\mathcal{Z}_{\kappa,\nu}$ and $F_4 = \kappa\partial_{x_4}\log\mathcal{Z}_{\kappa,\nu}$ where $\mathcal{Z}_{\kappa,\nu}$ is defined in (3.5). In particular, the marginal law of γ_1 is $\mathrm{hSLE}_\kappa(\nu)$ in $\mathbb{H}$ from x_1 to x_4 with marked points (x_2, x_3) stopped at the first exiting time of U_1, and the marginal law of γ_4 is $\mathrm{hSLE}_\kappa(\nu)$ in $\mathbb{H}$ from x_4 to x_1 with marked points (x_3, x_2) stopped at the first exiting time of U_4.*

Proof. The function $\mathcal{Z}_{\kappa,\nu}$ defined in (3.5) satisfies PDE (4.2) and COV (4.3) for

$$b = (\nu + 2)(\nu + 6 - \kappa)/(4\kappa).$$

Combining with Proposition 4.5, Part (a), we obtain the conclusion. □

4.4 Proof of Proposition 4.2

Proof of Proposition 4.2, Existence. Note that, given $\eta^L[0,T^L]$, the conditional law of the remaining part of η^L is $\mathrm{SLE}_\kappa(\rho)$ from w^L to y^L with force point w^L; given $\eta^R[0,T^R]$, the conditional law of the remaining part of η^R is $\mathrm{SLE}_\kappa(\rho)$ from w^R to y^R with force point w^R. Thus, to show the existence of the pair $(\eta^L;\eta^R)$ in Proposition 4.2, it is sufficient to show the existence of the pair $(\eta^L|_{[0,T^L]};\eta^R|_{[0,T^R]})$.

Set $\nu := \kappa - 8 - \rho < \kappa/2 - 4$. Let η^R be $\mathrm{hSLE}_\kappa(\nu)$ in Ω from x^R to x^L with marked points (y^R, y^L) conditioned to hit $(y^R y^L)$ (since $\nu < \kappa/2-4$, this event has positive chance). For $\epsilon > 0$, let T^R_ϵ be the first time that η^R hits the ϵ-neighborhood of $(y^R y^L)$. Given $\eta^R[0,T^R_\epsilon]$, let η^L be $\mathrm{hSLE}_\kappa(\nu)$ in $\Omega\setminus\eta^R[0,T^R_\epsilon]$ from x^L to $\eta^R(T^R_\epsilon)$ with marked points (y^L, y^R) conditioned to hit $(y^R y^L)$. Let T^L_ϵ be the first time that η^L hits the ϵ-neighborhood of $(y^R y^L)$. Here we obtain a pair of continuous simple curves $(\eta^L|_{[0,T^L_\epsilon]};\eta^R|_{[0,T^R_\epsilon]})$. We could also sample the pair by first sampling η^R and then sampling η^L conditional on η^R. Corollary 4.6 guarantees that the law on the pair $(\eta^L|_{[0,T^L_\epsilon]};\eta^R|_{[0,T^R_\epsilon]})$ does not depend on the sampling order. In order to apply Corollary 4.6, it is important that $\kappa \le 4$ and the curves do not hit each other almost surely. In this case, we could exhaust all dyadic localization neighborhoods, combining with Lemma 4.4, we could conclude that the law on the pair $(\eta^L|_{[0,T^L_\epsilon]};\eta^R|_{[0,T^R_\epsilon]})$ does not depend on the sampling order. This is true for all $\epsilon > 0$.

Let $\epsilon \to 0$, combining with the continuity of $\mathrm{hSLE}_\kappa(\nu)$ up to and including the first hitting time of $[y^R y^L]$ in Propositions 3.3 and 3.7, we could conclude that the law on the pair $(\eta^L|_{[0,T^L]};\eta^R|_{[0,T^R]})$ does not depend on the sampling order. Consider the pair $(\eta^L|_{[0,T^L]};\eta^R|_{[0,T^R]})$, we see that the conditional law of η^L given $\eta^R[0,T^R]$ is $\mathrm{SLE}_\kappa(\nu+2)$ in Ω^R from x^L to w^R with force point y^L up to the first hitting time of $(y^R y^L)$. By Lemma 2.6, we know that the conditional law of η^L given $\eta^R[0,T^R]$ is $\mathrm{SLE}_\kappa(\rho)$ in Ω^R from x^L to y^L with force point w^R up to the first hitting time of $(y^R y^L)$. Similarly, the conditional law of η^R given $\eta^L[0,T^L]$ is $\mathrm{SLE}_\kappa(\rho)$ in Ω^L from x^R to y^R with force point w^L up to the first hitting time of $(y^R y^L)$. This implies the existence part of Proposition 4.2. □

Proof of Proposition 4.2, Uniqueness. The uniqueness part could be proved similarly as the proof of [MS16b, Theorem 4.1]. The setting there is slightly different from ours and the same proof works. We will briefly summarize the proof and point out the different places. We construct a Markov chain on configurations in $X_0(\Omega; x^R, y^R, y^L, x^L)$: one transitions from one configuration $(\eta^L;\eta^R)$ by picking $i \in \{L, R\}$ uniformly and then resampling η^i according to the conditional law given the other one. The uniqueness of $\mathbb{Q}_q(\kappa,\rho)$ will follow from the uniqueness of the stationary measure of this Markov chain. The ϵ-Markov chain is defined similarly except in each step we resample the paths conditioned on them staying in $X^\epsilon_0(\Omega; x^R, y^R, y^L, x^L)$. Denote by P_ϵ the transition kernel for the ϵ-Markov chain. It suffices to show that there is a unique stationary distribution for the ϵ-Markov chain. Sending $\epsilon \to 0$ implies that the original chain has a unique stationary distribution.

It is proved in [MS16b] that the transition kernel for ϵ-Markov chain is continuous. In this part, the requirements are that the conditional law—$\mathrm{SLE}_\kappa(\rho)$— can be sampled as flow lines of GFF, and that the two curves do not hit each other almost surely. The conditional law is $\mathrm{SLE}_\kappa(\rho)$ with force point $w^L \in (y^R y^L)$ or $w^R \in (y^R y^L)$, thus the two curves do not hit for all $\rho > -2$ as long as $\kappa \le 4$. So our setting satisfies the two requirements. Let μ be any stationary distribution of the Markov chain, and let μ_ϵ be μ conditioned on $X^\epsilon_0(\Omega; x^R, y^R, y^L, x^L)$, then μ_ϵ is stationary for the ϵ-Markov chain. Let $\mathcal{S}_\epsilon$ be the set of all such stationary probability measures. Then $\mathcal{S}_\epsilon$ is convex and compact by the continuity of the transition kernel of the ϵ-Markov chain. By Choquet's Theorem, the measure μ_ϵ can be uniquely expressed as a superposition of extremal elements of $\mathcal{S}_\epsilon$. To show that $\mathcal{S}_\epsilon$ consists of a single element, it suffices to show that there is only one extremal in $\mathcal{S}_\epsilon$. Suppose that $\nu, \tilde{\nu}$ are two extremal elements in $\mathcal{S}_\epsilon$. By Lebesgue decomposition theorem, one can uniquely write $\nu = \nu_0 + \nu_1$ such that ν_0 is absolutely continuous and ν_1 is singular with respect to $\tilde{\nu}$. If ν_0 and ν_1 are both nonzero, since $\nu = \nu_0 P_\epsilon + \nu_1 P_\epsilon$, by the uniqueness of the Lebesgue decomposition, we see that ν_0 and ν_1 are both stationary and thus can be normalized as stationary distributions for the ϵ-Markov chain. This contradicts that ν is an extremal

measure. This implies that either ν is absolutely continuous with respect to $\tilde{\nu}$ or singular.

Next, it is proved in [MS16b] that it is impossible for ν to be absolutely continuous with respect to $\tilde{\nu}$. The same proof for this part also works here. The last part is showing that ν can not be singular with respect to $\tilde{\nu}$. Suppose $(\eta_0^L;\eta_0^R) \sim \nu$ and $(\tilde{\eta}^L;\tilde{\eta}^R) \sim \tilde{\nu}$ are the initial state for the ϵ-Markov chain. Then they argued that it is possible to couple $(\eta_2^L;\eta_2^R)$ and $(\tilde{\eta}_2^L;\tilde{\eta}_2^R)$ such that the event $(\eta_2^L;\eta_2^R) = (\tilde{\eta}_2^L;\tilde{\eta}_2^R)$ has positive chance. This implies that ν and $\tilde{\nu}$ can not be singular. The key ingredient in this part is [MS16b, Lemma 4.2] which needs to be replaced by Lemma 4.7 in our setting. □

Lemma 4.7. *Fix $\kappa \in (0,8)$ and $\rho > (-2) \vee (\kappa/2-4)$. Suppose $(\Omega; x^R, y^R, y^L, x^L)$ is a quad, $w^R \in (y^L y^R)$ is a boundary point, and $\tilde{\Omega} \subset \Omega$ is such that $\tilde{\Omega}$ agrees with Ω in a neighborhood of $(w^R x^L)$. Let η be an $\mathrm{SLE}_\kappa(\rho)$ in Ω from x^L to y^L with force point y^R and let $\tilde{\eta}$ be an $\mathrm{SLE}_\kappa(\rho)$ in $\tilde{\Omega}$ from x^L to y^L with force point w^R. Then there exists a coupling between η and $\tilde{\eta}$ such that the event $\{\eta = \tilde{\eta}\}$ has positive chance.*

Proof. Although the setting is different from it is in the proof of [MS16b, Lemma 4.2], the same proof works here. We can view η (resp. $\tilde{\eta}$) as the flow line of a GFF h in Ω (resp. the flow line of a GFF $\tilde{h}$ in $\tilde{\Omega}$). The key point is that the boundary value of h and $\tilde{h}$ agree in a neighborhood U of $(w^R x^L)$. Therefore $h|_U$ and $\tilde{h}|_U$ are mutually absolutely continuous. Since the flow lines are deterministic functions of the GFF, this implies that the laws of η and $\tilde{\eta}$ stopped upon first exiting U are mutually absolutely continuous. Since there is a positive chance for η to stay in U, the absolute continuity implies the conclusion. □

4.5 Proof of Theorem 1.4 and Corollary 1.6

In Definition 1.2, there is an ambiguity in the definition of Domain Markov Property: we need to specify what happens when $\eta^R[0,\tau^R]$ disconnects y^R from y^L (or $\eta^L[0,\tau^L]$ disconnects y^L from y^R). In this case, we think the CMP in Definition 1.2 becomes the CMP for $\eta^L|_{t\geq\tau^L}$ in Definition 2.7. In fact, this is the key point in showing the characterization part in Theorem 1.4.

Proof of Theorem 1.4. Suppose $(\eta^L;\eta^R) \sim \mathbb{P}_q$ with $q = (\Omega; x^R, y^R, y^L, x^L)$, and assume the same notations as in Figure 4.1. Since $(\eta^L;\eta^R)$ satisfies CMP, we know that the conditional law of η^L given η^R satisfies CMP in Definition 2.7. By Theorem 2.8, we know that the conditional law of η^L given η^R is $\mathrm{SLE}_\kappa(\rho)$ with force point w^R for some κ and ρ. Since we require the curves to be simple, we know that $\kappa \in (0,4]$ and $\rho > -2$. Similarly, the conditional law of η^R given η^L is $\mathrm{SLE}_{\tilde{\kappa}}(\tilde{\rho})$ for some $\tilde{\kappa} \in (0,4]$ and $\tilde{\rho} > -2$. By Symmetry in Definition 1.3, we know that $\tilde{\kappa} = \kappa$ and $\tilde{\rho} = \rho$. This implies $\mathbb{P}_q$ equals the probability measures $\mathbb{Q}_q(\kappa,\rho)$ in Proposition 4.2.

Next, we show that the pair $(\eta^L;\eta^R) \sim \mathbb{Q}_q(\kappa,\rho)$ satisfies CMP. For every η^L-stopping time τ^L and every η^R-stopping time τ^R, consider the conditional law of $(\eta^L|_{t\geq\tau^L}; \eta^R|_{t\geq\tau^R})$ given $\eta^L[0,\tau^L]$ and $\eta^R[0,\tau^R]$, it is clear that the conditional law of $\eta^R|_{t\geq\tau^R}$ given $\eta^L|_{t\geq\tau^L}$ is $\mathrm{SLE}_\kappa(\rho)$ and the conditional law of $\eta^L|_{t\geq\tau^L}$ given $\eta^R|_{t\geq\tau^R}$ is $\mathrm{SLE}_\kappa(\rho)$. Therefore, the pair $(\eta^L;\eta^R)$ satisfies CMP.

Finally, we show that the pair $(\eta^L;\eta^R) \sim \mathbb{Q}_q(\kappa,\rho)$ satisfies Condition C1. We only need to show that η^L satisfies Condition C1. Suppose $(Q;a,b,c,d)$ is an avoidable quad for η^L. By the comparison principle of extremal distance (see [Ahl10, Section 4-3]), we know that

$$d_{Q\setminus\eta^R}((ab),(cd)) \geq d_Q((ab),(cd)).$$

Note that the conditional law of η^L given η^R is $\mathrm{SLE}_\kappa(\rho)$ and $\mathrm{SLE}_\kappa(\rho)$ satisfies Condition C1 by Lemma 2.5, combining with the above inequality, we see that η^L satisfies Condition C1. □

Next, we will show Corollary 1.6. To this end, we first discuss the reversibility of $\mathrm{SLE}_\kappa(\rho)$ processes. Suppose $x \leq w \leq y$, and let η be an $\mathrm{SLE}_\kappa(\rho)$ in $\mathbb{H}$ from x to y with force point w. The process η does not have reversibility when $x < w < y$, see Lemma 4.8; but it enjoys reversibility when $w = x_+$, see [MS16b, Theorem 1.1] and [MS16c, Theorem 1.2]. The reversibility when $w = x_+$ is a deep result, and we do not need it in our paper.

Lemma 4.8. *Fix $\kappa \in (0,8)$, $\rho > -2$ and $x < w < y$. Suppose η is an $\mathrm{SLE}_\kappa(\rho)$ in $\mathbb{H}$ from x to y with force point w. Then the time-reversal of η is an $\mathrm{SLE}_{\tilde{\kappa}}(\tilde{\rho})$ from y to x with force point w if and only if $\tilde{\kappa} = \kappa$ and $\rho = \tilde{\rho} = 0$.*

Proof. Let $\hat{\eta}$ be the time-reversal of η. If $\hat{\eta}$ has the law of $\mathrm{SLE}_{\tilde{\kappa}}(\tilde{\rho})$, since the dimension of $\mathrm{SLE}_\kappa(\rho)$ process is $1 + \kappa/8$ [Bef08], we have $\tilde{\kappa} = \kappa$. It remains to show $\tilde{\rho} = \rho = 0$. Let $\tilde{\eta}$ be an $\mathrm{SLE}_\kappa(\tilde{\rho})$ in $\mathbb{H}$ from y to x with force point w.

When $\kappa \in (4,8)$ and $\rho \geq \kappa/2 - 2$, we have $\eta \cap (w,y) = \emptyset$ and $\tilde{\eta} \cap (w,y) \neq \emptyset$ almost surely. Thus $\hat{\eta}$ can not have the same law as $\tilde{\eta}$. When $\kappa \in (4,8)$ and $\rho \in (\kappa/2 - 4, \kappa/2 - 2)$, we have almost surely (see [MW17, Theorem 1.6])

$$\dim \eta \cap (w,y) = 1 - (\rho+2)(\rho+4-\kappa/2)/\kappa, \quad \dim \tilde{\eta} \cap (w,y) = 1 - (8-\kappa)/\kappa.$$

If $\hat{\eta}$ has the same law as $\tilde{\eta}$, then these two dimensions have to coincide, and hence $\rho = 0$ and therefore $\tilde{\rho} = 0$. When $\kappa \in (4,8)$ and $\rho \in (-2, \kappa/2 - 4]$, we know that η fills interval (w,y) whereas $\tilde{\eta} \cap (w,y)$ has no interior point. Thus the $\hat{\eta}$ can not have the same law as $\tilde{\eta}$.

When $\kappa \in (0,4]$ and $\rho < \kappa/2 - 2$, we have $\eta \cap (w,y) \neq \emptyset$ and $\tilde{\eta} \cap (w,y) = \emptyset$ almost surely. Thus $\hat{\eta}$ can not have the same law as $\tilde{\eta}$. When $\kappa \in (0,4]$ and $\rho \geq \kappa/2 - 2$, it is proved in Theorem 1.1 that $\hat{\eta}$ is $\mathrm{hSLE}_\kappa(\rho - 2)$ in $\mathbb{H}$ from y to x with marked points (y_-, w) which equals $\mathrm{SLE}_\kappa(\tilde{\rho})$ process from y to x with force point w if and only if $\rho = \tilde{\rho} = 0$. □

Now, we are ready to show Corollary 1.6

Proof of Corollary 1.6. Suppose $(\eta^L; \eta^R) \sim \mathbb{P}_q$ for $q = (\Omega; x^R, y^R, y^L, x^L)$. By the proof of Theorem 1.4, there exists $\kappa \in (0,4]$ and $\rho > -2$ such that the conditional law of η^L given η^R is $\mathrm{SLE}_\kappa(\rho)$ in Ω^R from x^L to y^L with force point w^R. By Reversibility in Definition 1.5, the conditional law of η^L given η^R should be reversible. Combining with Lemma 4.8, we see that $\rho = 0$. Therefore, the conditional law of η^L given η^R is SLE_κ. Similarly, the conditional law of η^R given η^L is SLE_κ. By Proposition 4.1, there exists a unique such probability measure and the marginal of η^R is hSLE_κ. □

To end this section, we will discuss the relation between Propositions 4.1 and 4.2. First, when $\rho^L \neq 0$ or $\rho^R \neq 0$, the pair $(\eta^L; \eta^R)$ in Proposition 4.1 satisfies neither CMP in Definition 1.2 nor Symmetry in Definition 1.3, whereas it satisfies Reversibility in Definition 1.5.

Next, we compare Proposition 4.2 with $\rho = 0$ and Proposition 4.1 with $\rho^L = \rho^R = 0$. In this case, the two propositions describe the same law on the pair $(\eta^L; \eta^R)$. From Proposition 4.2, we see that the marginal law of η^R is $\mathrm{hSLE}_\kappa(\kappa - 8)$ from x^R to x^L; whereas, from Proposition 4.1, the marginal law of η^R is hSLE_κ from x^R to y^R. This implies that hSLE_κ from x^R to y^R has the same law as $\mathrm{hSLE}_\kappa(\kappa - 8)$ from x^R to x^L. This is consistent with Proposition 3.11.

5 Convergence of Ising Interfaces to Hypergeometric SLE

5.1 Ising Model

Notations and terminologies. We focus on the square lattice $\mathbb{Z}^2$. Two vertices $x = (x_1, x_2)$ and $y = (y_1, y_2)$ are neighbors if $|x_1 - y_1| + |x_2 - y_2| = 1$, and we write $x \sim y$. The *dual square lattice* $(\mathbb{Z}^2)^*$ is the dual graph of $\mathbb{Z}^2$. The vertex set is $(1/2, 1/2) + \mathbb{Z}^2$ and the edges are given by nearest neighbors. The vertices and edges of $(\mathbb{Z}^2)^*$ are called dual-vertices and dual-edges. In particular, for each edge e of $\mathbb{Z}^2$, it is associated to a dual edge, denoted by e^*, that it crosses e in the middle. For a finite subgraph G, we define G^* to be the subgraph of $(\mathbb{Z}^2)^*$ with edge-set $E(G^*) = \{e^* : e \in E(G)\}$ and vertex set given by the end-points of these dual-edges. The *medial lattice* $(\mathbb{Z}^2)^\diamond$ is the graph with the centers of edges of $\mathbb{Z}^2$ as vertex set, and edges connecting nearest vertices. This lattice is a rotated and rescaled version of $\mathbb{Z}^2$, see Figure 5.1. The vertices and edges of $(\mathbb{Z}^2)^\diamond$ are called medial-vertices and medial-edges. We identify

the faces of $(\mathbb{Z}^2)^\diamond$ with the vertices of $\mathbb{Z}^2$ and $(\mathbb{Z}^2)^*$. A face of $(\mathbb{Z}^2)^\diamond$ is said to be black if it corresponds to a vertex of $\mathbb{Z}^2$ and white if it corresponds to a vertex of $(\mathbb{Z}^2)^*$.



(a) The square lattice. (b) The dual square lattice. (c) The medial lattice.

Figure 5.1: The lattices.

Let Ω be a finite subset of $\mathbb{Z}^2$. The Ising model with free boundary conditions is a random assignment $\sigma \in \{\ominus, \oplus\}^\Omega$ of spins $\sigma_x \in \{\ominus, \oplus\}$, where σ_x denotes the spin at the vertex x. The Hamiltonian of the Ising model is defined by

$$H_\Omega^{\text{free}}(\sigma) = -\sum_{x\sim y} \sigma_x \sigma_y.$$

The Ising measure is the Boltzmann measure with Hamiltonian H_Ω^{free} and inverse-temperature $\beta > 0$:

$$\mu_{\beta,\Omega}^{\text{free}}[\sigma] = \frac{\exp(-\beta H_\Omega^{\text{free}}(\sigma))}{Z_{\beta,\Omega}^{\text{free}}}, \quad \text{where } Z_{\beta,\Omega}^{\text{free}} = \sum_\sigma \exp(-\beta H_\Omega^{\text{free}}(\sigma)).$$

For a graph Ω and $\tau \in \{\ominus, \oplus\}^{\mathbb{Z}^2}$, one may also define the Ising model with boundary conditions τ by the Hamiltonian

$$H_\Omega^\tau(\sigma) = -\sum_{x\sim y, \{x,y\}\cap\Omega\neq\emptyset} \sigma_x\sigma_y, \quad \text{if } \sigma_x = \tau_x, \forall x \notin \Omega.$$

Ising model satisfies Domain Markov property: Let $\Omega \subset \Omega'$ be two finite subsets of $\mathbb{Z}^2$. Let $\tau \in \{\ominus, \oplus\}^{\mathbb{Z}^2}$ and $\beta > 0$. Let X be a random variable which is measurable with respect to vertices in Ω. Then we have

$$\mu_{\beta,\Omega'}^\tau[X \mid \sigma_x = \tau_x, \forall x \in \Omega' \setminus \Omega] = \mu_{\beta,\Omega}^\tau[X].$$

Suppose that $(\Omega; a, b)$ is a Dobrushin domain. The *Dobrushin boundary condition* is the following: $\oplus$ along (ab), and $\ominus$ along (ba). This boundary condition is also called domain-wall boundary condition.

The set $\{\ominus, \oplus\}^\Omega$ is equipped with a partial order: $\sigma \le \sigma'$ if $\sigma_x \le \sigma'_x$ for all $x \in \Omega$. A random variable X is increasing if $\sigma \le \sigma'$ implies $X(\sigma) \le X(\sigma')$. An event $\mathcal{A}$ is increasing if $\mathbb{1}_\mathcal{A}$ is increasing. The Ising model satisfies FKG inequality: Let Ω be a finite subset and τ be boundary conditions, and $\beta > 0$. For any two increasing events $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$, we have

$$\mu_{\beta,\Omega}^\tau[\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{B}] \ge \mu_{\beta,\Omega}^\tau[\mathcal{A}]\mu_{\beta,\Omega}^\tau[\mathcal{B}].$$

As a consequence of FKG inequality, we have the comparison between boundary conditions: For boundary conditions $\tau_1 \le \tau_2$ and an increasing event $\mathcal{A}$, we have

$$\mu_{\beta,\Omega}^{\tau_1}[\mathcal{A}] \le \mu_{\beta,\Omega}^{\tau_2}[\mathcal{A}]. \tag{5.1}$$

The critical value of β in Ising model is given by:

$$\beta_c = \frac{1}{2}\log(1+\sqrt{2}).$$

The critical Ising model is conformal invariant in the scaling limit. We will list two special properties for the critical Ising model that will be useful later: strong RSW and the convergence of the interface with Dobrushin boundary condition.

Given a quad $(Q; a, b, c, d)$ on the square lattice, we denote by $d_Q((ab), (cd))$ the discrete extermal distance between (ab) and (cd) in Q, see [Che16, Section 6]. The discrete extremal distance is uniformly comparable to and converges to its continuous counterpart— the classical extremal distance. The quad $(Q; a, b, c, d)$ is crossed by $\oplus$ in an Ising configuration σ if there exists a path of $\oplus$ going from (ab) to (cd) in Q. We denote this event by $(ab) \overset{\oplus}{\longleftrightarrow} (cd)$.

Proposition 5.1. *[CDCH16, Corollary 1.7]. For each $L > 0$ there exists $c(L) > 0$ such that the following holds: for any quad $(Q; a, b, c, d)$ with $d_Q((ab), (cd)) \geq L$,*

$$\mu^{mixed}_{\beta_c, Q}\left[(ab) \overset{\oplus}{\longleftrightarrow} (cd)\right] \leq 1 - c(L),$$

where the boundary conditions are free *on $(ab) \cup (cd)$ and $\ominus$ on $(bc) \cup (da)$.*



Figure 5.2: The Ising interface with Dobrushin boundary condition.

For $\delta > 0$, we consider the rescaled square lattice $\delta\mathbb{Z}^2$. The definitions of dual lattice, medial lattice and Dobrushin domains extend to this context, and they will be denoted by $(\Omega_\delta, a_\delta, b_\delta)$, $(\Omega^*_\delta, a^*_\delta, b^*_\delta)$, $(\Omega^\diamond_\delta, a^\diamond_\delta, b^\diamond_\delta)$ respectively. Consider the critical Ising model on $(\Omega^*_\delta, a^*_\delta, b^*_\delta)$. The boundary $\partial\Omega^*_\delta$ is divided into two parts $(a^*_\delta b^*_\delta)$ and $(b^*_\delta a^*_\delta)$. We fix the Dobrushin boundary conditions: $\ominus$ on $(b^*_\delta a^*_\delta)$ and $\oplus$ on $(a^*_\delta b^*_\delta)$. Define the *interface* as follows. It starts from $a^\diamond_\delta$, lies on the primal lattice and turns at every vertex of Ω_δ is such a way that it has always dual vertices with spin $\ominus$ on its left and $\oplus$ on its right. If there is an indetermination when arriving at a vertex (this may happen on the square lattice), turn left. See Figure 5.2. We have the convergence of the interface:

Theorem 5.2. *[CDCH$^+$14]. Let $(\Omega^\diamond_\delta; a^\diamond_\delta, b^\diamond_\delta)$ be a family of Dobrushin domains converging to a Dobrushin domain $(\Omega; a, b)$ in the Carathéodory sense. The interface of the critical Ising model in $(\Omega^*_\delta, a^*_\delta, b^*_\delta)$ with Dobrushin boundary condition converges weakly to* SLE_3 *as $\delta \to 0$.*

Theorem 5.3. *Let $(\Omega_\delta^\diamond; a_\delta^\diamond, w_\delta^\diamond, b_\delta^\diamond)$ be a family of triangles converging to a triangle $(\Omega; a, w, b)$ in the Carathéodory sense. The interface of the critical Ising model in $(\Omega_\delta^*, a_\delta^*, w_\delta^*, b_\delta^*)$ with the boundary condition $\ominus$ along $(b_\delta^* a_\delta^*)$, $\oplus$ along $(a_\delta^* w_\delta^*)$ and* free *along $(w_\delta^* b_\delta^*)$ converges weakly to* $\mathrm{SLE}_3(-3/2)$ *as $\delta \to 0$.*

Proof. It is proved in [HK13, BDCH16] that the interface with (free free) boundary conditions converges weakly to $\mathrm{SLE}_3(-3/2; -3/2)$ as $\delta \to 0$. The same proof works here. □

5.2 Proof of Theorem 1.7

Let $(\Omega_\delta; x_\delta^R, y_\delta^R, y_\delta^L, x_\delta^L)$ be a sequence of discrete quads on the square lattice $\delta\mathbb{Z}^2$ approximating some quad $q = (\Omega; x^R, y^R, y^L, x^L)$. Consider the critical Ising model in Ω_δ^* with alternating boundary conditions: $\ominus$ along $(x_\delta^L x_\delta^R)$ and $(y_\delta^R y_\delta^L)$, and $\xi^R \in \{\oplus, \text{free}\}$ along $(x_\delta^R y_\delta^R)$, and $\xi^L \in \{\oplus, \text{free}\}$ along $(y_\delta^L x_\delta^L)$. The quad is vertically crossed by $\ominus$ if there exists a path of $\ominus$ going from $(x_\delta^L x_\delta^R)$ to $(y_\delta^R y_\delta^L)$. The quad is horizontally crossed by $\oplus$ in an Ising configuration if there exists a path of $\oplus$ going from $(y_\delta^L x_\delta^L)$ to $(x_\delta^R y_\delta^R)$. We denote these events by

$$\mathcal{C}_v^\ominus(q) = \{(x_\delta^L x_\delta^R) \overset{\ominus}{\longleftrightarrow} (y_\delta^R y_\delta^L)\}, \quad \mathcal{C}_h^\oplus(q) = \{(y_\delta^L x_\delta^L) \overset{\oplus}{\longleftrightarrow} (x_\delta^R y_\delta^R\}.$$

Suppose there is a vertical crossing of $\ominus$. Let η_δ^L be the interface starting from x_δ^L lying on the primal lattice. It turns at every vertex in the way that it has spin $\oplus$ on its left and $\ominus$ on its right, and that it turns left when there is ambiguity. Let η_δ^R be the interface starting from x_δ^R lying on the primal lattice. It turns at every vertex in the way that it has spin $\ominus$ to its left and $\oplus$ to its right, and turns right when there is ambiguity. Then η_δ^L will end at y_δ^L and η_δ^R will end at y_δ^R. See Figure 1.1. Let Ω_δ^L be the connected component of $\Omega_\delta \setminus \eta_\delta^L$ with $(x_\delta^R y_\delta^R)$ on the boundary and denote by $\mathcal{D}_\delta^L$ the discrete extremal distance between η_δ^L and $(x_\delta^R y_\delta^R)$ in Ω_δ^L. Define Ω_δ^R and $\mathcal{D}_\delta^R$ similarly.

Lemma 5.4. *The variables $(\mathcal{D}_\delta^L; \mathcal{D}_\delta^R)_{\delta>0}$ is tight in the following sense: for any $u > 0$, there exists $\epsilon > 0$ such that*

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\mathcal{D}_\delta^L \geq \epsilon, \mathcal{D}_\delta^R \geq \epsilon \,|\, \mathcal{C}_v^\ominus(q)\right] \geq 1 - u, \quad \forall \delta > 0.$$

Proof. Since $(\Omega_\delta; x_\delta^L, x_\delta^R, y_\delta^R, y_\delta^L)$ approximates $(\Omega; x^L, x^R, y^R, y^L)$, by Proposition 5.1 and (5.1), we know that $\mathbb{P}[\mathcal{C}_v^\ominus(q)]$ can be bounded from below by some quantity that depends only on the extremal distance in Ω between $(x^L x^R)$ and $(y^R y^L)$ and that is uniform over δ. Thus, it is sufficient to show $\mathbb{P}\left[\{\mathcal{D}_\delta^L \leq \epsilon\} \cap \mathcal{C}_v^\ominus(q)\right]$ is small for $\epsilon > 0$ small. Given η_δ^L and on the event $\{\mathcal{D}_\delta^L \leq \epsilon\}$, combining Proposition 5.1 and (5.1), we know that the probability to have a vertical crossing of $\ominus$ in Ω_δ^L is bounded by $c(\epsilon)$ which only depends on ϵ and goes to zero as $\epsilon \to 0$. Thus $\mathbb{P}\left[\{\mathcal{D}_\delta^L \leq \epsilon\} \cap \mathcal{C}_v^\ominus(q)\right] \leq c(\epsilon)$. This implies the conclusion. □

Lemma 5.5. *Let $(\Omega_\delta; x_\delta^R, y_\delta^R, y_\delta^L, x_\delta^L)$ be a sequence of discrete quads on the square lattice $\delta\mathbb{Z}^2$ approximating some quad $q = (\Omega; x^R, y^R, y^L, x^L)$ as $\delta \to 0$. Consider the critical Ising model in Ω_δ with the alternating boundary condition:*

$$\ominus \text{ along } (x_\delta^L x_\delta^R) \cup (y_\delta^R y_\delta^L), \quad \xi^R \in \{\oplus, \text{free}\} \text{ along } (x_\delta^R y_\delta^R), \quad \text{and } \xi^L \in \{\oplus, \text{free}\} \text{ along } (y_\delta^L x_\delta^L).$$

Conditioned on the event $\mathcal{C}_v^\ominus(q)$, then there exists a pair of interfaces $(\eta_\delta^L; \eta_\delta^R)$ where η_δ^L (resp. η_δ^R) is the interface connecting x_δ^L to y_δ^L (resp. connecting x_δ^R to y_δ^R). The law of the pair $(\eta_\delta^L; \eta_\delta^R)$ converges weakly to the pair of SLE *curves in Proposition 4.1 as $\delta \to 0$ where $\kappa = 3$ and $\xi^R, \xi^L, \rho^R, \rho^L$ are related in the following way: for $q \in \{L, R\}$,*

$$\rho^q = 0, \quad \text{if } \xi^q = \oplus; \quad \rho^q = -3/2, \quad \text{if } \xi^q = \text{free}\,.$$

Proof. We only prove the conclusion for $\xi^R = \xi^L = \oplus$, and the other cases can be proved similarly (by replacing Theorem 5.2 with 5.3 when necessary). Combining Proposition 5.1 with (5.1) and Lemma 5.4, we see that the sequence $\{(\eta_\delta^L; \eta_\delta^R)\}_{\delta>0}$ satisfies the requirements in Theorem 2.4, thus the sequence is

relatively compact. Suppose $(\eta^L;\eta^R) \in X_0(\Omega;x^L,x^R,y^R,y^L)$ is any sub-sequential limit and, for some $\delta_k \to 0$,

$$(\eta^L_{\delta_k};\eta^R_{\delta_k}) \xrightarrow{d} (\eta^L;\eta^R) \quad \text{in } X_0(\Omega;x^L,x^R,y^R,y^L).$$

Since $\eta^L_{\delta_k} \to \eta^L$, by Theorem 2.2, we know that we have the convergence in all three topologies. In particular, this implies the convergence of $\Omega^L_{\delta_k}$ in Carathéodory sense. Note that the conditional law of $\eta^R_{\delta_k}$ in $\Omega^L_{\delta_k}$ given $\eta^L_{\delta_k}$ is the interface of the critical planar Ising model with Dobrushin boundary condition. Combining with Theorem 5.2, we know that, the conditional law of η^R in Ω^L given η^L is SLE_3. By symmetry, the conditional law of η^L in Ω^R given η^R is SLE_3. By Proposition 4.1, there exists a unique such measure. Thus it has to be the unique sub-sequential limit. □



(a) When there is a vertical crossing of $\ominus$, there exists a pair of interfaces $(\eta^L;\eta^R)$: η^R is the interface from x^R to y^R and η^L is the interface from x^L to y^L.



(b) When there is a horizontal crossing of $\oplus$, there exists a pair of interfaces $(\eta^B;\eta^T)$: η^B is the interface from x^R to x^L and η^T is the interface from y^R to y^L.

Figure 5.3: Consider the critical Ising in Ω with the boundary condition: $\ominus$ along $(x^Lx^R)\cup(y^Ry^L)$ and $\oplus$ along $(x^Ry^R)\cup(y^Lx^L)$.

Lemma 5.6. *Let $(\Omega_\delta;x^R_\delta,y^R_\delta,y^L_\delta,x^L_\delta)$ be a sequence of discrete quads on the square lattice $\delta\mathbb{Z}^2$ approximating some quad $q=(\Omega;x^R,y^R,y^L,x^L)$ as $\delta\to 0$. Consider the critical Ising in Ω_δ with the following boundary condition:*

$$\ominus \text{ along } (x^L_\delta x^R_\delta)\cup(y^R_\delta y^L_\delta), \quad \oplus \text{ along } (x^R_\delta y^R_\delta)\cup(y^L_\delta x^L_\delta).$$

- *On the event $\mathcal{C}^{\ominus}_v(q)$, let η_δ be the interface connecting x^R_δ and y^R_δ. Then the law of η_δ converges weakly to* hSLE_3 *in Ω from x^R to y^R with marked points (x^L,y^L).*
- *On the event $\mathcal{C}^{\oplus}_h(q)$, let η_δ be the interface connecting x^R_δ and x^L_δ. Then the law of η_δ converges weakly to* hSLE_3 *in Ω from x^R to x^L with marked points (y^R,y^L).*

Proof. On the event $\mathcal{C}^{\ominus}_v(q)$, there is a pair of Ising interfaces $(\eta^L_\delta;\eta^R_\delta)$, as indicated in Figure 5.3 (a). By Lemma 5.5, we know that the sequence $(\eta^L_\delta;\eta^R_\delta)$ converges weakly to the pair of SLEs in Proposition 4.1 with $\kappa=3$ and $\rho^L=\rho^R=0$. In particular, the law of η^R_δ conditioned on $\mathcal{C}^{\ominus}_v(q)$ converges weakly to hSLE_3 in Ω from x^R to y^R. The other case can be proved similarly. □

Lemma 5.7. *Let $(\Omega_\delta;x^R_\delta,y^R_\delta,y^L_\delta,x^L_\delta)$ be a sequence of discrete quads on the square lattice $\delta\mathbb{Z}^2$ approximating some quad $q=(\Omega;x^R,y^R,y^L,x^L)$ as $\delta\to 0$. Consider the critical Ising in Ω_δ with the following boundary condition:*

$$\ominus \text{ along } (x^L_\delta x^R_\delta), \quad \oplus \text{ along } (x^R_\delta y^R_\delta)\cup(y^L_\delta x^L_\delta), \quad \text{free along } (y^R_\delta y^L_\delta).$$



(a) When there is a vertical crossing of $\ominus$, there exists a pair of interfaces $(\eta^L;\eta^R)$: η^R is the interface from x^R to y^R and η^L is the interface from x^L to y^L.



(b) When there is a horizontal crossing of $\oplus$, there exists a pair of interfaces $(\eta^B;\eta^T)$: η^B is the interface from x^R to x^L and η^T is the interface from y^R to y^L.

Figure 5.4: Consider the critical Ising in Ω with the boundary condition: $\ominus$ along (x^Lx^R), $\oplus$ along $(x^Ry^R)\cup(y^Lx^L)$, and free along (y^Ry^L).

- *On the event $\mathcal{C}_v^{\ominus}(q)$, let η_δ be the interface connecting x_δ^R and y_δ^R. Then the law of η_δ (up to the first hitting time of $[y_\delta^R y_\delta^L]$) converges weakly to* $\mathrm{hSLE}_3(-7/2)$ *from x^R to x^L conditioned to hit $[y^Ry^L]$ (up to the first hitting time of $[y^Ry^L]$).*
- *On the event $\mathcal{C}_h^{\oplus}(q)$, let η_δ be the interface connecting x_δ^R and x_δ^L. Then the law of η_δ converges weakly to* $\mathrm{hSLE}_3(-3/2)$ *from x^R to x^L.*

Proof. On the event $\mathcal{C}_v^{\ominus}(q)$, there is a pair of Ising interfaces $(\eta_\delta^L;\eta_\delta^R)$, as indicated in Figure 5.4 (a). By a similar argument as in Lemma 5.5, the sequence $(\eta_\delta^L;\eta_\delta^R)$ converges weakly to the pair of SLEs in Proposition 4.2 with $\kappa=3$ and $\rho=-3/2$. In particular, the law of η_δ^R conditioned on $\mathcal{C}_v^{\ominus}(q)$ converges weakly to $\mathrm{hSLE}_3(-7/2)$ in Ω from x^R to x^L conditioned to hit $[y^Ry^L]$.

On the event $\mathcal{C}_h^{\oplus}(q)$, there is a pair of Ising interfaces $(\eta_\delta^B;\eta_\delta^T)$ as indicted in Figure 5.4 (b). By Lemma 5.5, we see that the sequence $(\eta_\delta^B;\eta_\delta^T)$ converges weakly to the pair of SLEs in Proposition 4.1 (rotated by 90 degree counterclockwise) with $\kappa=3$ and $\rho=-3/2$. In particular, the law of η_δ^B conditioned on $\mathcal{C}_h^{\oplus}(q)$ converges weakly to $\mathrm{hSLE}_3(-3/2)$ in Ω from x^R to x^L. □

Proof of Theorem 1.7. Theorem 1.7 is a collection of Lemma 5.6 and Lemma 5.7. □

6 Appendix: Hypergeometric Functions

For $A,B,C\in\mathbb{R}$, the hypergeometric function is defined for $|z|<1$ by the power series:

$$F(z)={}_2\mathrm{F}_1(A,B,C;z)=\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\frac{(A)_n(B)_n}{(C)_n}\frac{z^n}{n!},$$

where $(x)_n$ is the Pochhammer symbol $(x)_n:=x(x+1)\cdots(x+n-1)$ for $n\geq 1$ and $(x)_n=1$ for $n=0$. The power series is well-defined when $C\notin\{0,-1,-2,-3,\ldots\}$, and it is absolutely convergent on $z\in[0,1]$ when $C>A+B$. When $C>A+B$ and $C\notin\{0,-1,-2,-3,\ldots\}$, we have

$$F(1)=\frac{\Gamma(C)\Gamma(C-A-B)}{\Gamma(C-A)\Gamma(C-B)},\tag{6.1}$$

where Γ is Gamma Function. The hypergeometric function is a solution of Euler's hypergeometric differential equation

$$z(1-z)F''(z)+(C-(A+B+1)z)F'(z)-ABF(z)=0.\tag{6.2}$$

If C is not an integer, around the point $z = 0$, two independent solutions are

$$ {}_2\mathrm{F}_1(A, B, C; z), \quad z^{1-c}\, {}_2\mathrm{F}_1(1 + A - C, 1 + B - C, 2 - C; z). $$

If $C - A - B$ is not an integer, around the point $z = 1$, two independent solutions are

$$ {}_2\mathrm{F}_1(A, B, 1 + A + B - C; 1 - z), \quad (1 - z)^{C-A-B}\, {}_2\mathrm{F}_1(C - A, C - B, 1 + C - A - B; 1 - z). $$

Lemma 6.1. *When $C > 0$ and $AB > 0$, the function $F(z)$ is increasing for all $z \in [0, 1)$.*

Proof. We have $F(0) = 1$ and $F'(0) = AB/C > 0$. If the conclusion is false, then there exists $z_0 \in (0, 1)$ such that F is increasing for $z \in (0, z_0)$ and is decreasing for $z \in (z_0, z_0 + \epsilon)$ for some $\epsilon > 0$. This implies that z_0 is a local maximum and thus $F(z_0) \geq 1$, $F'(z_0) = 0$ and $F''(z_0) < 0$ (note that $F''(z_0) \neq 0$ since the zero points of F' are simple). However, by (6.2), we have $z_0(1 - z_0)F''(z_0) = ABF(z_0)$, contradiction. □

References

[Ahl10] Lars Valerian Ahlfors. *Conformal invariants: topics in geometric function theory*, volume 371. American Mathematical Soc., 2010.

[AS92] Milton Abramowitz and Irene A. Stegun, editors. *Handbook of mathematical functions with formulas, graphs, and mathematical tables*. Dover Publications, Inc., New York, 1992. Reprint of the 1972 edition.

[BBK05] Michel Bauer, Denis Bernard, and Kalle Kytölä. Multiple Schramm-Loewner evolutions and statistical mechanics martingales. *J. Stat. Phys.*, 120(5-6):1125–1163, 2005.

[BDCH16] Stéphane Benoist, Hugo Duminil-Copin, and Clément Hongler. Conformal invariance of crossing probabilities for the Ising model with free boundary conditions. *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré Probab. Stat.*, 52(4):1784–1798, 2016.

[Bef08] Vincent Beffara. The dimension of the SLE curves. *Ann. Probab.*, 36(4):1421–1452, 2008.

[Bil99] Patrick Billingsley. *Convergence of Probability Measures*. 1999.

[CDCH+14] Dmitry Chelkak, Hugo Duminil-Copin, Clément Hongler, Antti Kemppainen, and Stanislav Smirnov. Convergence of ising interfaces to schramms sle curves. *Comptes Rendus Mathematique*, 352(2):157–161, 2014.

[CDCH16] Dmitry Chelkak, Hugo Duminil-Copin, and Clément Hongler. Crossing probabilities in topological rectangles for the critical planar FK-Ising model. *Electron. J. Probab.*, 21:Paper No. 5, 28, 2016.

[Che16] Dmitry Chelkak. Robust discrete complex analysis: A toolbox. *The Annals of Probability*, 44(1):628–683, 2016.

[CN07] Federico Camia and Charles M. Newman. Critical percolation exploration path and SLE_6: a proof of convergence. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 139(3-4):473–519, 2007.

[CS12] Dmitry Chelkak and Stanislav Smirnov. Universality in the 2D Ising model and conformal invariance of fermionic observables. *Invent. Math.*, 189(3):515–580, 2012.

[Dub07] Julien Dubédat. Commutation relations for Schramm-Loewner evolutions. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 60(12):1792–1847, 2007.

[Dub09] Julien Dubédat. Duality of Schramm-Loewner evolutions. *Ann. Sci. Éc. Norm. Supér. (4)*, 42(5):697–724, 2009.

[Gra07] K. Graham. On multiple Schramm-Loewner evolutions. *J. Stat. Mech. Theory Exp.*, (3):P03008, 21, 2007.

[HK13] Clément Hongler and Kalle Kytölä. Ising interfaces and free boundary conditions. *Journal of the American Mathematical Society*, 26(4):1107–1189, 2013.

[Izy15] Konstantin Izyurov. Smirnov's observable for free boundary conditions, interfaces and crossing probabilities. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 337(1):225–252, 2015.

[KP16] Kalle Kytölä and Eveliina Peltola. Pure partition functions of multiple SLEs. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 346(1):237–292, 2016.

[KS17] Antti Kemppainen and Stanislav Smirnov. Random curves, scaling limits and loewner evolutions. *Ann. Probab.*, 45(2):698–779, 03 2017.

[Law05] Gregory F. Lawler. *Conformally invariant processes in the plane*, volume 114 of *Mathematical Surveys and Monographs*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2005.

[Law09] Gregory Lawler. A note on the Brownian loop measure. 2009.

[LSW03] Gregory F. Lawler, Oded Schramm, and Wendelin Werner. Conformal restriction: the chordal case. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 16(4):917–955 (electronic), 2003.

[LSW04] Gregory F. Lawler, Oded Schramm, and Wendelin Werner. Conformal invariance of planar loop-erased random walks and uniform spanning trees. *Ann. Probab.*, 32(1B):939–995, 2004.

[LW04] Gregory F. Lawler and Wendelin Werner. The Brownian loop soup. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 128(4):565–588, 2004.

[MS16a] Jason Miller and Scott Sheffield. Imaginary geometry I: Interacting SLEs. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 164(3-4):553–705, 2016.

[MS16b] Jason Miller and Scott Sheffield. Imaginary geometry II: Reversibility of $\mathrm{SLE}_\kappa(\rho_1;\rho_2)$ for $\kappa \in (0,4)$. *Ann. Probab.*, 44(3):1647–1722, 2016.

[MS16c] Jason Miller and Scott Sheffield. Imaginary geometry III: Reversibility of SLE_κ for $\kappa \in (4,8)$. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 184(2):455–486, 2016.

[MW17] Jason Miller and Hao Wu. Intersections of SLE Paths: the double and cut point dimension of SLE. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 167(1-2):45–105, 2017.

[PW17] Eveliina Peltola and Hao Wu. Global Multiple SLEs for $\kappa \leq 4$ and Connection Probabilities for Level Lines of GFF, 2017.

[Qia16] Wei Qian. Conformal restriction: The trichordal case, 2016.

[RS05] Steffen Rohde and Oded Schramm. Basic properties of SLE. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 161(2):883–924, 2005.

[Sch00] Oded Schramm. Scaling limits of loop-erased random walks and uniform spanning trees. *Israel J. Math.*, 118:221–288, 2000.

[Smi01] Stanislav Smirnov. Critical percolation in the plane: conformal invariance, Cardy's formula, scaling limits. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math.*, 333(3):239–244, 2001.

[SS09] Oded Schramm and Scott Sheffield. Contour lines of the two-dimensional discrete Gaussian free field. *Acta Math.*, 202(1):21–137, 2009.

[SS13] Oded Schramm and Scott Sheffield. A contour line of the continuum Gaussian free field. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 157(1-2):47–80, 2013.

[SW05] Oded Schramm and David B. Wilson. SLE coordinate changes. *New York J. Math.*, 11:659–669 (electronic), 2005.

[Wu16] Hao Wu. Alternating arm exponents for the critical planar Ising model, 2016.

[WW13] Wendelin Werner and Hao Wu. From $\mathrm{CLE}(\kappa)$ to $\mathrm{SLE}(\kappa,\rho)$. *Electron. J. Probab.*, 18:no. 36, 1–20, 2013.

[WW17] Menglu Wang and Hao Wu. Level lines of Gaussian Free Field I: Zero-boundary GFF. *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, 127(4):1045–1124, 2017.

[Zha08] Dapeng Zhan. Reversibility of chordal SLE. *Ann. Probab.*, 36(4):1472–1494, 2008.

Hao Wu
NCCR/SwissMAP, Section de Mathématiques, Université de Genève, Switzerland
and Yau Mathematical Sciences Center, Tsinghua University, China
hao.wu.proba@gmail.com